



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2013

No. 27

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 26, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title without amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 298. An act to prevent nuclear proliferation in North Korea, and for other purposes.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CITIZENS UNITED DECISION DEEPLY FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Late last year, the Supreme Court overturned a century-old Montana law that prohibited corporate spending in that State's elections. In the Montana case, the Supreme Court had the chance to revisit its deeply flawed 2010 decision in *Citizens United*. But despite the urgings of members of the Court itself and a public shell-shocked by the recent torrent of unregulated corporate expenditures, the Court chose instead to double down and reaffirm the conclusion of *Citizens United* that corporations are people—at least as far as the First Amendment is concerned.

As a legal decision, the *Citizens United* opinion was remarkable in many ways: in its willingness to overturn a century of jurisprudence, in its choice to issue as broad a ruling as possible rather than as narrow as the case and the Constitution required, and in its reliance on minority or concurring views in prior decisions rather than the prevailing opinions in those same cases. As Justice Stevens pointed out in a striking dissent, nothing had really changed since prior controlling case law except the composition of the Court itself. So much for stare decisis.

But what stood out most about *Citizens United* was not the Court's legal reasoning, but its staggering naivete, as the Court confidently declared:

We now conclude that independent expenditures, including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption.

Unfortunately, the five Justices who joined this opinion must be the last five Americans to feel that way. Certainly none of the evidence before the Court in *Citizens United* or the Montana case compelled a conclusion so at odds with reality.

To be fair to the present Court, they did not invent the distinction between direct contributions, which can be regulated, and independent expenditures, which may not. That flawed distinction

goes back more than 35 years to *Buckley v. Valeo*, where the Court attempted to place limits on both forms of campaign spending. In *Buckley*, the Court felt that there was a compelling State interest in regulating contributions to candidates but that there was not yet sufficient evidence of a similarly compelling need to regulate independent expenditures, but the Court acknowledged the need to revisit that conclusion in the future if events should prove otherwise.

Events have most certainly proved otherwise following *Citizens United*. Since that decision, corporate expenditures have reached in the billions of dollars, and the "independence" of those expenditures—their theoretical separation from the officeholders they are intended to influence—is a fiction no one buys anymore. The proliferation of super PACs and their outsized influence on House, Senate, and Presidential politics is beyond dispute by all except those five Americans who happen to sit on the Court.

But if the Montana case makes anything clear, it is that the Court has dug in. No amount of unrestrained spending, no appearance of impropriety or actual corruption of our system is likely to dislodge this newly entrenched precedent from the threat it poses to our democracy. Regrettably, a constitutional amendment is required for that.

Fortunately, one of the Nation's pre-eminent constitutional scholars, Harvard law professor Lawrence Tribe, has drafted one, which I have introduced as H. Res. 31. It provides simply:

Nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to forbid the Congress or the States from imposing content-neutral limitations on private campaign contributions or independent election expenditures.

The amendment also allows, but does not require, public financing of campaigns when States choose to enact such laws, providing:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H631

Nor shall this Constitution prevent Congress or the States from enacting systems of public campaign financing, including those designed to restrict the influence of private wealth by offsetting campaign spending or independent expenditures with increased public funding.

The tidal wave of independent expenditures creates an unmistakable appearance of impropriety, and over time it cannot help but corrupt. The Court having failed to bear witness to these debilitating changes since Buckley, the people have the power to act. Independent expenditures, like direct contributions, should be subject to reasonable limits and should be transparent. And corporations are not people; for if they were, as Justice Stevens points out, how could we deprive them of the right to vote?

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Like most of my colleagues last week when we were home, I took as many opportunities as possible to speak at civic clubs, meet with groups of people, and talk about a range of issues. But I also always brought up the fact that we continue to fund a failed policy in Afghanistan. I was pleased and also humbled by the response from these groups as they agreed with me totally; and many of these groups, Mr. Speaker, were actually veterans. I represent the Third Congressional District of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, and we have over 60,000 retired military.

Those who were in the military who are now retired said, You're absolutely right; why doesn't Congress wake up? There's nothing we're going to change in Afghanistan. Stop wasting lives and spending money.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to this. On Monday, an AP article:

Afghan President Hamid Karzai on Sunday ordered all U.S. special forces to leave Wardak within 2 weeks and requested that their operations there cease immediately. The restive province, which neighbors Kabul province and is viewed as a gateway to the capital, has been the focus of counterinsurgency efforts in recent years.

Why do we fund a man that doesn't even like us? I don't understand that at all. How in the world can the Congress in its wisdom not speak out and say, Listen, you're talking about a 10-year agreement after 2014? How can a country that's financially broke commit to 10 more years after 2014? I do not understand that.

In fact, I have introduced, with ROSA DELAUNO, H.R. 125, the Congressional Oversight of Afghanistan Agreement Act of 2013, which is a bipartisan bill introduced by us, and we are reaching out to our other colleagues to say, Congress, let's get on the floor. Let's debate whether we should stay there 10 years after 2014 or not.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the American people would back this legislation because the American people have seen the total chaos right here this week, last week, and the next couple weeks to come talking about sequestration. But I don't think the leader of Afghanistan is worried about sequestration because we're going to send him all of the money he wants while we tell the American people, We're going to cut your jobs; we're going to cut your programs. That, to me, is absolutely ridiculous and unacceptable.

□ 1010

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people to say to Congress, let's start rebuilding America and stop rebuilding the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, beside me is a poster of a young Army officer who lost both legs and an arm. We fail to realize here in Congress, maybe not all of us, but some of us, that we're still at war. Young men and women are still getting their legs blown off, they're losing their lives many times—not as often as in the past. But let's wake up, Congress. Let's start debating what we're going to do to rebuild our country and stop trying to rebuild the rest of the world.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please not let the American people and not let Congress forget that we have young men and women in Afghanistan. And I will close by asking God to please bless the United States of America and let us never, never forget the sacrifice of war.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we continue an unfortunate and unnecessary countdown to the irrational and reckless automatic cuts the Republican policies will impose. The countdown stands at three days. Unless Congress acts by Friday, the cuts will take effect, with dangerous results across the country and in the Fifth District of Maryland, my district.

Approximately, 46,000 civilian defense personnel will be at risk of being furloughed at installations in Maryland, including Pax River, Webster Field, Indian Head, and Joint Base Andrews. This will undermine their ability to serve our Nation and keep America safe.

Federal defense contracts could be canceled or reduced, which will translate into lost jobs—an economic hurt for the communities they affect.

There will be cuts to the FDA, which, as I said, are in Maryland's Fifth District. National FDA cuts could result in fewer food safety inspectors for consumers.

And children will be kicked out of Head Start. There will be longer wait

times for those seeking to access job-training and placement services. Our first responders will lose much-needed personnel.

This year alone in Maryland, the sequester could mean up to 500 fewer victims of domestic violence receiving critical services. And around 2,050 children unable to receive vaccines for communicable diseases like measles, mumps, whooping cough and the flu. This is not a rational way forward.

Law enforcement could lose about \$317,000 in my own State for this year in grants that support crime prevention and drug treatment and enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are hardworking folks who just want the chance to pursue the American Dream. Many of them are Federal employees who have already been forced to cut back as a result of some of the actions that we've taken. Others are defense contractors who support our men and women in uniform who are at the point of the spear and rely on these defense contractors to keep them well-equipped and well-trained. They cannot afford the arbitrary, irrational cuts that are set to take effect in just 4 days.

Even if some here believe Congress does not have a responsibility to create opportunities, at least I think we can agree that Congress has a responsibility not to prevent them. I believe Congress has an important role to play in making sure our businesses can compete, our communities can thrive, and our people can make it in America.

That's what is at stake in the policies that we are confronting today. They remain extremely disappointed that some in this Chamber are actively supporting the sequester's painful and indiscriminate cuts as a viable path forward. As a matter of fact, many Members on the Republican side have said "bring it on, this is what we want to do." To do so, in my opinion, is gravely irresponsible.

Marylanders, and all Americans, deserve a Congress that takes our challenges seriously. None of our challenges are more serious or more immediate this week than the dangers of allowing the cuts to take effect.

That's why I have cosponsored a bill with Mr. VAN HOLLEN and many others on the Democratic side of the aisle to replace the cuts for the remainder of the year with a balanced approach to reduction, a balanced approach which will bring down our deficit, bring down our debt, but will do so in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Majority Leader, you have the power to bring that bill to the floor today. And if you don't agree with it, don't vote for it. But allow the American people to see their representatives have the opportunity to vote for a rational policy so that we do not pursue an irrational policy that will undermine jobs in America and the growth of our economy.

Only a balanced solution can achieve the savings we need and still afford our

investments in attracting middle class jobs.

As we count down to Friday, what are we doing on this House floor? Well, yesterday we did a suspension bill. Today we will do a suspension bill. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, nobody, outside of the particular interest groups will know what those suspension bills are.

And then we will consider a bill on Wednesday and Thursday, an important bill. We should have passed it in the last Congress. But we ought to be dealing with these cuts that are confronting our country starting on Friday and Saturday.

As we count down to Friday, I will continue to work towards an agreement that will avert these arbitrary, hurtful cuts and protect Maryland families and businesses from congressional partisanship gone awry.

And I am encouraging those who live in my district, and anyone else, to visit my page on Facebook and share how the proposed cuts will impact you, your loved ones, and your community.

For the sake of our families, Mr. Speaker, our small businesses, our children, our teachers, our defense contracts, our public servants, our first responders, and others, I urge my Republican colleagues to embrace the spirit of compromise that has been so absent of late in this Chamber. I call on them to work with Democrats to find a balanced, sensible, smart, rational, and responsible solution to our deficits.

Mr. Speaker, we have 3 days left to go. Let's bring something to the floor that's a solution. Let's do it now.

RECOGNITION OF WAYNE ALDERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Today, we honor the memory of Private First Class Wayne Alderson of Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, a World War II hero awarded the Combat Infantry Badge, Silver Star, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart for his courageous actions during the Rhineland Campaign of 1945. PFC Alderson died on February 22, 2013.

At 86, Wayne was a member of our Greatest Generation and a great American. This son of southwestern Pennsylvania lived a life of purpose and sacrifice, and remains an inspiration to those who knew him.

Born on June 7, 1926, Wayne Alderson entered the United States Army as an 18-year-old on August 31, 1944. His service would help bring Nazism to its knees, and PFC Alderson would become the first American soldier to advance into Germany across the forbidding, tank-protected Siegfried line on March 15, 1945.

In the course of this assault, PFC Alderson, serving as a scout for B Company, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Infantry Division, would single-handedly de-

stroy two machine gun emplacements, attack pockets of German snipers, and fight house-to-house at night before capturing and taking three German prisoners. At considerable personal risk, he led the prisoners back to headquarters, where vital information was obtained by the Allies about the Siegfried line defenses.

Then, on March 18, in Rieschweiler, Germany, the 18-year-old private would lead a new assault against enemy forces. His company pierced the German line but was cut off by enemy soldiers. Fearing the Germans were about to launch a counterattack that would wipe out his men, PFC Alderson and two other soldiers volunteered to lead a surprise assault and disappeared down a long zigzag spider trench behind a dense warren of fortifications.

□ 1020

The assault would ultimately help melt German defenses along the Siegfried line and leave PFC Alderson's face permanently scarred, carrying the shrapnel of a bitter, closed-quarters firefight. The small and vulnerable patrol engaged the larger German force in combat at point-blank range. PFC Alderson, fully exposed and vastly outnumbered, charged with his men, inflicting 12 casualties on the advancing enemy.

With the Germans now in retreat, Wayne was seriously injured when a grenade exploded at his feet, blasting shrapnel and debris into his face. Wayne crashed face first into the mud from the blow. One of his fellow soldiers attempted to flip him over to prevent him from suffocating to death. A sniper took that soldier's life.

The shooting over, PFC Alderson, suffering from a head wound, crawled back through the trenches to brief his company commander on the events that had just transpired. The company commander later surveyed the battle scene and determined the three men had killed at least 35 German soldiers.

Wayne was discharged from service on October 6, 1945, with the rank of private first class.

Wayne's leadership continued after the war. He helped resolve a conflict between labor and management at Pittron Steel, retold in the book "Stronger than Steel," a dispute that threatened to shutter the company but instead saved jobs and changed Pittron's corporate culture.

Fittingly, after this episode, Wayne went on to found a consulting firm called Value of the Person, which he ran for the last 40 years. Value of the Person grew out of Wayne Alderson's unique theory of management, stressing the importance of respect and responsibility between management and its workers—commonsense ideas that too often can become lost in the hum of modern life. These ideas became the basis of a book co-written with his daughter, "Theory R Management," in 1994.

On May 20, 2007, I had the privilege of presenting Wayne Alderson, the hero of

the Rhineland campaign, with the Silver Star when he was inducted into the veterans memorial Hall of Valor.

PFC Alderson is survived by his wife, Nancy, of 60 years; sisters, Lillie Shannon and Jeanne Alderson of Canonsburg; daughter, Nancy McDonnell; and a grandson, Patrick Wayne McDonnell.

Wayne Alderson always put his country first. Now it is time for PFC Alderson's country to recognize his bravery and place him among the first rank of those Americans who helped liberate Europe and beat back the twin scourges of fascism and Nazism. It is in this spirit that we recognize Wayne Alderson today.

The way Wayne lived his life with continued selfless courage and determination gave Americans a true hero to mentor the next generation. Indeed, Wayne Alderson's influence will have a lasting impact on that next generation. And through that, he lives on.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, we thank Wayne Alderson for his service and his life for his country.

SEQUESTRATION EFFECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. We know from polling that most Americans have no idea what "sequester" means at all. In fact, one of our colleagues said that she was talking to a constituent who said, Yes, I am all for sequester. Let's sequester all the Members of Congress in a room and make sure that they come up with a plan.

That's not exactly the idea. "Sequester," which most Americans don't know the definition of, actually means that for domestic discretionary spending—the things that help ordinary people and communities and law enforcement—there will be about a 9 percent across-the-board cut; just a meat-ax approach. You can't even decide between cutting conferences or leave in the research into cancer at the National Institutes of Health. No, everything is going to be across the board, a real meat-ax approach. There will also be about a 13 percent across-the-board cut in military spending. That's what we're talking about. And if people aren't following exactly what the definition is, they're going to soon find out what it means in their ordinary life.

In education, we're going to see cuts that are going to require the firing of teachers. About 70,000 little children are not going to be able to have their Head Start programs. Small businesses are going to find that almost \$900 million will be unavailable to them in loans for their small businesses. We're going to lose about 2,100 food safety inspectors. How will it feel if we don't know for sure if we're going to have safe food available? And we've all been talking about the need for more mental health services around this whole issue

of gun violence, yet it's predicted that about 373,000 adults and children who need mental health services won't find them available.

Military readiness will be affected. We got some data on every State. In my State of Illinois, approximately 14,000 civil Department of Defense employees are going to be furloughed under the sequester; and that means reducing the gross pay that comes to them, citizens of Illinois, by \$83.5 million. That's money that they won't be able to spend in our economy. Base operation funding for Army bases will be cut about \$19 million in Illinois, and funding for Air Force operations will be cut by about \$7 million. These are real cuts in military readiness.

Vaccines for children. Does anybody really think that the way to save on our budget is to cut the availability of vaccines for little children? And does anybody really think that the burden of cutting the deficit should be on the backs of senior citizens? The median income for people over 65 years old is \$22,000 a year. The average Social Security benefit is \$15,000 a year and provides most of the income for most of the seniors in this country.

Does anybody think there isn't one tax loophole that can be closed, not one more penny that can come from huge and profitable corporations that often pay no taxes? We have some of those huge corporations paying no taxes, outsourcing jobs, setting up their corporate headquarters in post office boxes in the Cayman Islands. Some of them are getting, actually, tax breaks, refunds from the government.

Multimillionaires and billionaires can't pay a penny more, but we can cut the National Institutes of Health and research for finding cancer cures; that new drug approvals ought to be cut; that we ought to cut veterans services; that people ought to just wait longer at airports. We should even shut down some airports because we're going to have to furlough the air traffic controllers; that we should cut Meals on Wheels for senior citizens, that that's really the preferable way to go.

I have to tell you this is just a crazy way to do business in the United States Congress, particularly since we have sensible alternatives. We have not seen one bill from the Republican side of the aisle that says, Here's our idea instead of these meat-ax cuts that are going to hurt people, and the Democrats have several bills we should be hearing on this floor.

SEQUESTER CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before I speak about the sequester, I want to salute my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for his earlier remarks about Afghanistan. I agree with him that we need to stop trying to rebuild

the world and start putting our own country and our own people first once again. We have spent several trillion dollars over the past decade on very unnecessary wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we should have brought our troops home many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about the sequester. WMAL radio reported this morning that the administration had put out in a list of cuts which the sequestration would require that the National Drug Intelligence Center in Pennsylvania would be cut by \$2 million. The only problem is that this center no longer even exists. It was closed in June of last year.

The scare tactics about the sequester seem to grow more ridiculous, more exaggerated every day. The Washington Examiner wrote, in its lead editorial yesterday, that:

It is known as the Washington Monument Strategy. Turf-protecting government executives and bureaucrats go out of their way to make spending cuts as painful as possible for as many people as possible. By applying any cuts to the very things the public benefits from most, bureaucratic infighters believe they can convince the public that every penny that goes into government is necessary.

In other words, the administration has apparently told all the Departments and Agencies to say that their most popular programs will be drastically cut, instead of reducing spending on their least popular, least necessary, most wasteful programs.

□ 1030

The sequester has already been reduced from \$109 billion to \$85 billion. This sequester is a cut of slightly over 2 percent from our almost \$4 trillion budget. Many people seem to have already forgotten that the fiscal cliff deal raised taxes by \$620 billion over the next 10 years on upper-income people. Then there is also the \$93 billion in higher payroll taxes on all workers this year. That hike is already in effect. Then there are the taxes already coming in to pay for ObamaCare.

Columnist Mark Tapscott wrote yesterday:

The sequestration scares are the ultimate example of Washington wink-wink. Politicos from both parties warn of imminent disaster if the Federal budget is "cut," even though they know government spending will be higher in 2013 even if the sequestration "cuts" are implemented. Put another way, the sequestration scares are lies, pure and simple. Not just bunk, not just distortions or misstatements, but lies. And every professional politician in town—Democrat, Republican, Libertarian, Socialist, Independent—knows it.

Our national debt is now at a mind-boggling \$16.5 trillion. It will go to over \$25 trillion in the next 10 years under optimistic scenarios. The Congressional Budget Office a few days ago put out a report that said the interest on our national debt—just the interest—was going to go from \$224 billion this fiscal year to an astounding \$857 billion in 10 years. If we allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker, we will then not be able

to pay for anything other than Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest on the debt.

The sequester we are talking about now is minuscule when compared to our present debt and our future pension liabilities. Our choice is simple: we can cut now or crash in the very near future.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. The gentleman from Tennessee who just spoke said that sequestration is a game of scare tactics. Apparently, he hasn't looked at the statistics from his district in Tennessee. Let me tell you, sequestration is not only going to affect the people of my district, but it's going to affect the people of his district and his State as well.

Sequestration is very troubling, Mr. Speaker. Sensible people all across America are beginning to see the impact that sequestration will have on their families. We are hearing from Governors every day, both Democrat and Republican. We cannot wait any longer. We have delayed this for far too long. The consequences of an unbalanced budget are very, very clear.

My home State of North Carolina already has one of the highest rates of unemployment at 9 percent; and these cuts, Mr. Speaker, to education, health care, low-income families, and military readiness around my State and country will be disastrous to so many.

Our children are our most valuable asset, and ensuring they earn a quality education is the best investment we can make in our future. Unfortunately, the sequester threatens many children's chances at obtaining a quality education.

The impacts of sequester in my State of North Carolina are huge. Teachers and schools in North Carolina will lose more than \$25 million in funding for primary and secondary education, putting 350 teachers and teacher aide jobs at risk, resulting in 40,000 fewer students receiving services they need to help them do well in school. Programs like Head Start and Early Head Start—services that residents in my district so desperately need—will be eliminated for 1,500 children, reducing access to critical early education programs that teach the skills necessary to enter kindergarten on an equal footing.

If America, Mr. Speaker, is to continue to be a global leader, we must out-compete other nations in the classroom by improving the caliber of teachers, promoting school grants, increasing education standards, and utilizing up-to-date technology to prepare students for the higher education and jobs of the future. However, educational advances will only result if our schools are properly funded. Don't cut education.

The American people must know that the sequester's reach stretches to health care research and innovation. Hospitals around the country and those in my district, like Duke University Medical Center, serve an invaluable role in the community to not only care for those who are sick, but to research and find cures for critical diseases such as cancer, diabetes, and heart disease—curable diseases that kill people every day. Don't let this happen.

The across-the-board cuts would sever funding for research from organizations like the National Institutes of Health. Scientists at universities across my district, like at Duke University and East Carolina University, would not have the chance to discover groundbreaking medical advancements such as the one that earned Duke University's Dr. Robert Leftkowitz the 2012 Nobel Prize in chemistry.

Many citizens in my district are low-income families who are currently surviving with assistance from critical antipoverty programs like unemployment benefits, SNAP, and WIC. Low- and middle-income families will bear the brunt of the pain from this sequester. These people deserve programs that provide relief from financial hardships. However, if Congress does not work together to prevent sequestration this week, these programs will lose very significant portions of their budgets.

North Carolina has an enormous military presence; the sequester will be felt especially hard by our men and women in uniform and the civilians that support military operations. Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, and U.S. Coast Guard Air Station Elizabeth City, among others, will not be ready to defend and serve our country at a moment's notice if we allow this to happen.

In my State alone, cuts to the Department of Defense budget will result in 22,000 civilian DOD staff being furloughed, reducing the gross pay by \$117 million. Base operation funding would be cut by \$136 million, severely reducing military readiness, putting our country at peril.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to work together to prevent the impending sequestration so that we may prevent devastating cuts to our vital infrastructure. We are slowly but surely building on economic recovery, and our Nation can literally not afford to be knocked down again by an inability to compromise. Please, let's get it done.

RECOGNITION OF ANTHONY TIMBERLANDS AND ARKANSAS FORESTRY PRODUCERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with good news from south Arkansas.

According to recent news reports, Anthony Timberlands, a cornerstone of the Arkansas timber and forestry products industry, is currently in the process of adding a second shift to its sawmill in Bearden, Arkansas. This second shift will result in the hiring of 65 new employees in addition to creating numerous other support positions within the company and in the surrounding area of south Arkansas.

I want to recognize Anthony Timberlands for this exciting announcement and their longstanding commitment to the people and the economy of south Arkansas. But as I reflect on Anthony Timberlands' announcement, I can't help but think of how many more jobs could have been added throughout Arkansas and the United States if it weren't for the excessive regulation of the Obama administration.

For example, States have worked in conjunction with the Federal Government for 40 years to manage forest roads and prevent pollution with State-managed best practices. This partnership has proven effective and provided regulatory certainty for many decades. Unfortunately, President Obama's EPA wants to impose a nationwide standard, giving them the complete regulatory authority over an industry that supports nearly 3 million workers and contributes \$115 billion to our economy each year.

Under this standard, the EPA will be able to shut down businesses that don't comply with their arbitrary and misguided rules. States have a 40-year track record of effectively regulating these roads, and we should let them continue for at least another 40.

To take another example, the EPA's new boiler rule demonstrates this administration's preference for ideology over sound economics and business sense. With compliance costs in excess of \$3 billion and 105,000 jobs threatened, this rule inflicts unnecessary costs on our economy at a time when we can least afford it.

In addition, our timber producers have no guarantee that EPA won't move the goalpost once again and reopen the regulations as they have in the past. What timber and forestry product companies want—what all businesses want, for that matter—is certainty, not more regulation. They need to know that investment in a new factory or new equipment today means they can keep using it once it's built instead of living in fear of the government closing their doors tomorrow.

□ 1040

These companies aren't asking for special preferences or another \$800 billion in failed stimulus funds; they're simply asking for predictable and fair rule of law, not arbitrary regulation.

Mr. Speaker, companies like Anthony Timberlands provide quality jobs and lasting economic growth for places like south Arkansas and the rest of America, despite the obstacles the

Obama administration has put in their place. I look forward to working with my colleagues to eliminate burdensome regulations and red tape that slow growth, hurt communities and diminish opportunity. We should celebrate companies that empower hard-working Americans to do what they do best: create high quality products that lead the world.

THE GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we lurch into another series of artificial crises surrounding budget sequestration, there is a bright spot this week. We will witness an amazing series of visits on Capitol Hill by members of the Garden Club of America. Celebrating their 100th year as a national organization established in 1913, there is no more awesome group of citizen lobbyists than these women from all across America.

I first encountered the women's garden club in the person of the late Nancy Russell, who was a member of the Portland Garden Club and a ferocious, tenacious advocate for the protection of the national treasure that is the Columbia River Gorge. Nancy's personal commitment, insight, drive and passion made it possible for politicians in both parties to enact historic unique legislation protecting the magnificent Columbia River Gorge and establishing a framework of protection for generations to come.

Nancy would marshal her argument with facts, was an expert at generating positive publicity, could turn on the charm, and if that didn't work, she could play hardball politics with the best of them. Imagine my surprise and delight in coming to Congress when I found that there were other advocates—although there will never be another Nancy Russell—there are other women from across America who had their own commitment, passion, zeal, focus and follow-through who were enriching their communities while they helped the national conservation discussion.

The Garden Club has a broad and ambitious agenda seeking to promote our open spaces, and zealous in their support for our threatened National Park System. They're strong advocates and protectors of the Land and Water Conservation Act and the LWCF funds that have so rarely been fully budgeted in the program's 50 years.

Now, global warming inspires heated rhetoric here on Capitol Hill. And while garden club members are deeply concerned about weather instability caused by climate change, they do so with a calm, clear, dispassionate view of the facts in a way that should inspire and encourage everybody here in Congress.

For years, they have advocated for a farm bill that was stronger in the areas

of nutrition, conservation, and environmental protection while saving money. They advocate harnessing the power of that farm bill to protect sustainable agriculture and the production of specialty crops—which most of America calls “food”.

In the midst of some of the most bizarre accusations one will ever hear, theirs is a clarion call of rationality and wisdom for the ratification of the Treaty of the Sea that is languishing. Despite the support of the Bush, Clinton, and Obama administrations and an unprecedented coalition of business, industry, and educational leaders, the United States continues to be an outlier, to the detriment of our defense and commercial interests.

These are just a few of the areas that they concentrate on during their Washington visit. Most important, they connect what is happening at the local level with people who care about clean air, the beauty of the landscape and the treasures that enrich our souls, as well as the things that protect the environment for future generations. I strongly urge my colleagues to find time to visit with the Garden Club representatives from their State not just here in Washington, D.C., this week, but reach out to them at home and hear what they have to say. There will be no more productive meeting you will have with the inspiration that comes from listening to clear-headed, clear-eyed voices of wisdom and restraint. These meetings will stand out as an oasis in the war of words over our next round of manufactured crises.

VIOLENT MEDIA AND GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the failure to discuss mental health issues and the impact of the violent media in the whole debate following the tragic shooting in Newtown, Connecticut. There needs to be a three-legged approach to this problem. It is disappointing that the President only addressed the issue of guns in the State of the Union speech.

In a number of these tragic shootings, there has been a pattern of the shooters' playing violent video games. Do you remember Columbine? And do you remember the movie theater shooting in Aurora, Colorado? Now comes a report from the Hartford Courant. I quote from the Hartford Courant:

During a search of the Lanza home after the deadly school shootings, police found thousands of dollars worth of graphically violent video games. And detectives working the scene of the massacre are exploring whether Adam Lanza might have been emulating the shooting range or a violent video game scenario as he moved from room to room at Sandy Hook spewing bullets, law enforcement sources have told the Courant.

Before he killed his mother and set off for Sandy Hook Elementary, Adam Lanza de-

stroyed the hard drive on his computer, which probably kept some of the records of the games he played and whom he played with. He also may have destroyed any chance to see if he had a manifesto or had written down anything indicating that he planned the shootings, or why he chose the elementary school.

Soon after the Newtown shooting, I asked the National Science Foundation, which is funded as a result of the subcommittee which I chair, to pull together experts, some of the best experts—and the National Science Foundation picked them—from across the country to look at the impact of all three contributors to mass violence. Earlier this month, the National Science Foundation released its report.

This is the report, “Youth Violence: What We Need to Know,” which supports my belief that rampage shootings are a result of multiple factors, including access to firearms, mental health issues, and exposure to violent media, including violent video games. This report can be found on my Web site. I would urge anyone who really wants to see what we need to do to go look at the National Science Foundation report. It is guns, it is mental health issues, and it is violent video games.

It is easy for the President of the United States to take on the NRA. Why hasn't he asked the entertainment industry to play a greater role in this debate? Common sense tells us that the level of violence on TV, in the movies and in many video games is a problem. One only has to read the piece from the Hartford Courant to understand that this is a very serious problem.

You have to look at guns, you have to look at their mental health—and, quite frankly, the administration has not looked at mental health, and this Congress is not looking at mental health—and you have to look at violent video games and media. The administration is not looking at that, and, quite frankly, this Congress is not looking at it.

MEDIA VIOLENCE AND YOUTH VIOLENCE

Brad J. Bushman, Ph.D., Professor of Communication and Psychology, Margaret Hall and Robert Randal Rinehart Chair of Mass Communication, The Ohio State University & Professor of Communication Science, VU University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

When violent shooting spree occur, people want to identify “the” cause. Violent behavior is very complex and is caused by multiple risk factors, often acting together. One possible risk factor is exposure to violent media (e.g., TV programs, films, video games). Of course, it is impossible to know whether exposure to violent media causes shooting spree because researchers can't use guns in their laboratory experiments! However, in one experimental study, we measured what could be considered assaultive behavior. Dutch boys ($M_{age}=14$) played a violent or non-violent video game for 20 minutes, and rated how much they identified with the game character (e.g., “I wish I were a character such as the one in the game”). Afterwards, they competed on a task with another “boy” where the winner could blast the loser with loud noise through headphones. They were told that the highest noise levels (i.e., 8, 9, or

10) could cause “permanent hearing damage.” Boys who played a violent game, and identified with the violent character in that game, did in fact administer potentially damaging noise blasts. During the debriefing, one boy said, “I blasted him with level 10 noise because he deserved it. I know he can get hearing damage, but I don't care!” Another boy said he liked the violent game “because in this game you can kill people and shoot people, and I want to do that too.” A third boy said, “I like Grand Theft Auto a lot because you can shoot at people and drive fast in cars. When I am older I can do such things too. I would love to do all these things right now!”

A comprehensive meta-analysis of violent video game effects, which included 381 effects from studies involving 130,295 participants from all over the world, found that violent video games increased aggressive thoughts, angry feelings, physiological arousal, and aggressive behavior. Violent games also decreased prosocial behavior (e.g., helping, cooperation) and feelings of empathy for others. The effects occurred for males and females of all ages, regardless of the country they live in. Similar effects have been found for all types of violent media (e.g., TV, film, music and music videos, comic books). A meta-analysis of 26 studies involving 13,661 participants found that violent media exposure is also significantly linked to violent behavior (e.g. punching, beating, choking others), although the effects are smaller than for aggressive behavior. This makes sense because violent criminal behavior is rarer and more difficult to predict than less severe aggressive behavior. As one example, a recent CDC-funded, cross-sectional study involving incarcerated delinquents (and a comparison group of high-school students), parents/guardians, and teachers/staff, found that consumption of violent media was related to serious violent behavior such as using a weapon against another child.

It is well known that people who consume a lot of violent media come to view the world as a hostile place. People who consume a lot of violent media also think violence is “normal” behavior, because media characters often use violence to solve their problems.

It is useful to consider a child's life as filled with a succession of social problems that must be solved. The child uses a set of programs (called scripts) for solving social problems. In theater, scripts tell actors what to do and say. In memory, scripts define situations and guide behavior: The person first selects a script for the situation, assumes a role in the script, and behaves according to the script. In many shooting spree, the perpetrator puts on a uniform (e.g., hockey mask, trench coat, movie costume, military uniform), as if following a script. This allows the perpetrator to identify more closely with other killers. The perpetrator then gathers up a bunch of guns and ammunition, goes to a place where there are a lot of people gathered, kills as many people as possible, and then often kills himself. For most people, carrying out such a script would be impossible. But it can occur for some people who don't experience negative emotions or who see such acts as normative, or for whom performing such an act might be perceived as achieving a sense of accomplishment and “leaving their mark on the world.” Consider, for example, statements made by the two killers at Columbine High School. Dylan Klebold said, “Directors will be fighting over this story.” Eric Harris added, “Tarentino, Spielberg.”

There is also a downward spiral between aggression, rejection, and consumption of violent media. Aggressive youth tend to be rejected by their peers, and therefore spend their time consuming media (often violent

media) and associating with other aggressive youth (who have also been rejected by others), which, in turn makes them even more aggressive.

Aggressive youth often consume violent media because it allows them to justify their own behavior as being normal. A child's own aggressive behavior normally should elicit guilt, but this guilt is relieved if the child who has behaved aggressively consumes violent media. The reduction in guilt that consuming violence provides makes continued aggressive and violent behavior by that child even more likely.

Violent media often contain guns, and research has shown that the mere presence of guns, even at a subliminal level, can increase aggression. In summary, violent behavior is very complex and is caused by multiple risk factors, often acting together. One possible risk factor is exposure to violent media (e.g., TV programs, films, video games). Although it is not the only risk factor, or the most important risk factor, it is one of the easiest risk factors to change. Other risk factors (e.g., being male, social rejection) are difficult or impossible to change. Parents can, however, restrict the amount of violent media their children consume.

Parents are the key, but producers of violent media can help parents out. For example, there could be a universal rating system on all media (TV, films, video games), with universal symbols that are easy for parents to understand. The PEGI (Pan European Game Information) system, for example, has five age-based ratings (3+, 7+, 12+, 16+, 18+) and six well-recognized symbols for potentially objectionable material (violence, sex, drugs, discrimination, fear, gambling). The current rating system is like alphabet soup and is confusing to parents (e.g., R for movies; TV-MA for TV, FV for fantasy violence in video games). Another possible idea is to put warning labels on violent video games. In 1964, the U.S. surgeon general issued a warning on tobacco, and that warning appears on all tobacco products. In 1972, the U.S. surgeon general issued a warning for violent TV programs: "It is clear to me that the causal relationship between televised violence and antisocial behavior is sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action . . . There comes a time when the data are sufficient to justify action. That time has come." Warning labels are like a double-edged sword. On the one hand, parents find warning labels informative. On the other hand, they are like magnets to children.

Educating parents about the research on violent video games is also important. This is an uphill battle, however, because the source of news and information for parents is the mass media, and the mass media are reluctant to report that violent media are harmful.

Almost all of the research on violent video games has been conducted using single-player video games. But players often play with others. In a pair of studies conducted in our lab, participants were tested in pairs with an ostensible partner of the same sex (actually a confederate). Participants in the cooperative condition were instructed to work together with their partner to get as many points as possible by killing enemies and staying alive. Participants in the competitive condition were instructed to try and kill their partner more times than their partner killed them. Participants in the control condition played the game in the single player mode. After gameplay, participants competed with their ostensible partner on a task in which the winner could blast the loser with loud, unpleasant noise through headphones. In both studies, participants in the cooperative condition were less aggressive

than participants in the other conditions. More research on multi-player games is clearly needed.

More research is also needed on what types of individuals are most strongly affected by violent video games. Many of the spree shooters have been described as "social outcasts." Are such individuals more likely to behave aggressively after playing a violent game? Are such individuals more likely to play violent games alone?

Research should test whether aggression is enhanced by playing in a first-person compared with third-person mode, and by whether the enemies are realistic humans versus aliens. Some research has shown that the gorier the video game, the larger the effects, but more is needed.

A PLACE AT THE TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise to talk about the issue of hunger in America. There are over 50 million Americans who go hungry each year. That is about one in every six Americans who don't know where their next meal is coming from on any given day. Mr. Speaker, in the richest, most prosperous country in the world, that is unconscionable. Unfortunately, too many people simply don't know that there's a hunger problem in the United States. But that is going to change with a new documentary called "A Place at the Table."

□ 1050

Mr. Speaker, this powerful film shows how hunger actually affects everyday Americans. Specifically, "A Place at the Table," documents people from all walks of life—from inner-city Philadelphia to rural Colorado—and it shows how they struggle not just to put healthy food on their kitchen tables, but in some cases to put any food on their tables at all.

The film doesn't just show how people struggle with food. It shows how the lack of food impacts the health of children and the capacity for kids to pay attention and learn in class.

In all candor, Mr. Speaker, I play a small part in this film, and I'm pleased the filmmakers allowed me to give my thoughts on the problem of hunger in America in ways that we can address it. But this film is not about my opinions; it's about the challenge facing the people in this movie. It's about how our country got to the place where over 50 million people—or one in six Americans—are food insecure or hungry. It's about how our legislative policies are not meeting the needs of the hungry, especially as low- and middle-income families continue to struggle during this economic recovery. It's about how parents and grandparents are trying to take care of their families, but are falling short of doing it on their own. It's about how private organizations like churches and synagogues and food banks are trying to fill the gaps, but are struggling to do so be-

cause the need is so great. Ultimately, it's about how we as a Nation have the chance to rise up and end hunger now. It's about how we can and must develop a plan to end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, we have the means to end hunger now. We have the food to end hunger now. We have the knowledge to end hunger now. We just haven't mustered the political will to end hunger now, and we—Members of Congress—should all be ashamed that one person, let alone over 50 million, goes hungry in America.

In 1968, CBS News broadcast an hour-long program called "Hunger in America." It reshaped the view of hunger in this country. The day after that show aired, then-Senator George McGovern formed the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and worked with Senator Bob Dole and President Richard Nixon to reduce hunger in America. They almost eradicated it completely, but we've clearly regressed in the decades since.

I hope "A Place at the Table," this critically important film, is the catalyst that jump-starts a new effort to end hunger now. I believe we need White House leadership on this issue, and I urge President Obama to watch this film and to follow up with a White House conference on food and nutrition in order to tackle all of the issues associated with hunger and nutrition and specifically to come up with a coordinated, unified plan to end hunger now. President Obama's leadership is critical if we're going to end hunger now.

Directors Kristi Jacobson and Lori Silverbush, along with executive producer Tom Colicchio, have made a film that tells a powerful story. It's a story of a struggle in America, but a struggle that we can overcome. It's a struggle to address a problem that we have the answer to. It's my hope that this film will spark a new movement to address both hunger and obesity and nutritional issues so that we no longer see people struggling to put food on their table.

"A Place at the Table" is hard to watch because we all share the blame for the struggles faced by those in the film. I challenge anyone who watches it to walk away feeling unaffected. I've seen it many times already. I've been inspired by the individuals who are featured in the movie, people who struggle in poverty with great difficulty and who struggle with great dignity.

I'm also frustrated and angered by this film. It shows our failures—our moral failures—to end the scourge of hunger. The title of the film is appropriate. We all have our place at the table, and we need to take that place in order to end hunger now.

AVERT THE SEQUESTER AND ACT NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, there are just 3 days before \$85 billion in harmful

across-the-board spending cuts take effect. And here we are again, with an all-too-familiar manufactured crisis poised to strike our economy with another self-inflicted wound. Month to month, crisis to crisis, this is no way to run the world's largest economy.

Letting sequestration happen is not responsible government. The sequester was designed last year to scare Congress into responsibly reducing the deficit. It created a doomsday scenario: draconian damaging cuts—disliked by both parties—intended to force Democrats and Republicans to come up with a balanced alternative to reduce our deficit.

Sequestration cuts are not targeted to eliminate waste or unnecessary programs. Rather, they slash programs across the board, regardless of their effectiveness. This threatens our economic progress, jeopardizes our military readiness, and reduces funding for national priorities like education and medical research.

Mr. Speaker, sequestration would be devastating for Michigan and our Nation's economy. The sequester eliminates jobs at a time when Congress should be working to create them. Our country has been moving in the right direction: 35 straight months of private sector job growth; 6.1 million private sector jobs created. There's no doubt we can do more to grow our economy and the middle class, and letting sequestration happen is a giant step backward for our economy.

Economists across the political spectrum agree that letting sequestration happen will slow our economy. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequester would reduce our economic growth by a third this year alone.

Sequestration cuts affect the most vulnerable people: middle class families, seniors, students, people with disabilities, the unemployed, and those who may become unemployed if these cuts go into place. We can't pretend that these cuts are just numbers in a budget.

If sequester is allowed to happen, Michigan alone stands to lose 31,000 jobs in just 6 months. There will be 750,000 jobs lost nationally by October. Michigan schools would lose \$22 million in funding, eliminating 300 teachers and aides in the classroom. An additional \$20 million would be cut for educational support for children with disabilities. Head Start would be eliminated for 2,300 Michigan children. Almost 2,500 low-income students in my State would no longer receive aid to help them pay for college.

These cuts are real, Mr. Speaker. Just last week I cosponsored legislation with my Democratic colleagues to avoid the sequester, but Republicans won't even bring the bill to the floor for a vote.

The Democrats plan to avoid sequester through responsible spending cuts, increased revenues, and promoting economic growth. Our plan eliminates tax-

payer-funded subsidies for big oil companies. In a time of record oil profits and \$4-a-gallon gasoline, it baffles me that our country continues to subsidize companies like ExxonMobil and BP; yet Republicans are willing to pink-slip 750,000 American workers just to protect billions of dollars in handouts for these five big oil companies. It's time to end these subsidies.

There's no question that we need to cut the deficit, but we need to do it in a balanced way that protects the middle class. The Budget Control Act passed before I came to Congress reduced the deficit by more than \$2.5 trillion, mainly through spending cuts. There are certainly other areas that should be cut, but we should be strategic in cutting spending to reduce our deficit. Sequestration takes the exact opposite approach. It irrationally cuts programs that have proven to be effective and are worthwhile investments.

Congress needs to act immediately in order to avert the sequester. Republican inaction threatens to leave these indiscriminate cuts in place, killing jobs, undermining public safety and first responders, and injecting more uncertainty into our markets, harming our economy.

Our Nation cannot afford any more uncertainty, obstruction, and delay. Democrats are interested in real solutions, not sequesters.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to act.

□ 1100

SEQUESTERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Last week, I organized leaders from across Connecticut in small business, labor, government, health care, and social services to hear from them about the impact of sequestration. My constituents were pleased to also brief our House Democratic whip, STENY HOYER, at a roundtable in Farmington. The consequences of across-the-board cuts are frightening to say the least. People are scared, and people are extremely frustrated with Congress—and justifiably so.

In central and northwest Connecticut—and I know the same holds true across the country—manufacturers, small businesses, and working- and middle class families are doing things right. Having struggled through a tough economy, manufacturers like Ward Leonard in Thomaston and Marion Manufacturing in my hometown of Cheshire have been innovating and making strides.

Mr. Speaker, people are hopeful that we are finally on the verge of better days, but somehow Congress has missed every opportunity to avoid this very avoidable sequester, which would not only squander opportunities but would outright devastate our economy and hurt small businesses and families across the country.

At our roundtable, JoAnn Ryan, president of northwest Connecticut's Chamber of Commerce, said that local small business owners see "pockets of opportunity," but they have "no confidence whatsoever because of the inability of government to cooperate." My friend John Harrity, president of the Connecticut State Council of Machinists, put it perfectly when he said that, after all the progress our manufacturers have made, "to lose all that momentum just defies common sense."

That's not to mention what I heard from folks across the district about the devastating and reckless impact sequestration would have on social services, our seniors, and our children's education at every level. Let's not forget that folks in Connecticut and across the Northeast are still recovering from Hurricane Sandy and recent winter storms. Our constituents have had to wait far too long for emergency recovery funds, and they're still recovering and are trying to rebuild their lives, to rebuild their homes and their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, according to George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis, sequestration will directly and indirectly cost Connecticut almost 42,000 jobs. We need to remember that this isn't just a number. It's people's livelihoods, and it's their lives.

Letting the sequester happen will hurt Head Start students and their teachers in Danbury and New Britain, seniors in Meriden who rely on Meals on Wheels for their daily nutrition, manufacturers like Ansonia Copper & Brass in Waterbury, and small businesses throughout Torrington and the northwest corner, and employees and owners who are working hard to achieve the American Dream for themselves and to bring back the American economy.

What's maybe most troubling is that there is no reason businesses and families in Connecticut, or in any State, should be facing this catastrophe. It is entirely self-inflicted and avoidable if our colleagues would let us vote on an alternative. It's the result of a reckless game of chicken. Avoiding it is actually very simple, and the lack of urgency the House GOP leadership has shown in addressing this impending deadline is astounding.

Mr. Speaker, we can and should vote to remove this self-inflicted threat. We can and should remove the sequester. We already have a balanced replacement. Representative VAN HOLLEN's Stop the Sequester Job Loss Now Act would replace the sequester with commonsense, cost-cutting policies—repealing subsidies for Big Oil and Big Gas, refocusing subsidies for Big Agriculture and enacting a Buffett rule so that the wealthiest are paying their fair share. We should be allowed to vote on this bill.

Folks in Connecticut and across the country can't afford this gamesmanship. They need us to act. They need us to do our jobs so that they can keep doing theirs.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, sequestration is a self-inflicted wound that really does not have to happen.

I hate to make my Tea Party friends uncomfortable by using a dirty word, but with a little compromise we can get this thing passed. If Tea Party Republicans choose not to compromise, sequestration will arbitrarily take \$85 billion out of our economy, lowering our GDP and harming our economic recovery.

We shouldn't sacrifice our economic well-being because Republicans are unwilling to vote for one penny in new contributions from their billionaire friends. Republicans continue to stand up for the billionaires. They continue to stand up for the oil companies and all of the other powerful interests out there that are making money hand over foot while middle class Americans are asked to shoulder the burden of the Tea Party obsession of cutting government.

Now, there is a big difference, ladies and gentlemen, between cutting government and cutting services that people need and depend on. There is a big difference between having a less costly government versus not having a government to do the things that people need to be done. Let's take, for instance, the Defense budget. Last week, at a constituents' meeting, Senator JOHN MCCAIN said that these sequester cuts could significantly undermine military programs.

"We are facing a situation where our national security is at risk," Senator MCCAIN said, adding that furloughs could affect as many as 49,000 military and defense jobs in Arizona.

I'll tell you, in Georgia, what's going to happen is that 37,000 civilian Department of Defense employees will be furloughed, reducing gross pay by \$190 million. Army base funding would be cut by \$233 million, and funding for Air Force operations would be cut by \$5 million. This is in the State of Georgia. This is for this current fiscal year. Can you imagine that much money coming out of the economy and its not having an impact on the overall economy? It certainly will.

Let's take all of those who travel. You go to the airport. You rely on the air traffic controllers to make sure that the planes are situated and are flying safely so that nobody is going to bump into each other up there in the sky. You're dependent on your TSA personnel to check and make sure that nobody is armed when one gets on the plane. All of those services that you take for granted will be cut if we continue to embark upon this self-inflicted wound of sequestration.

A balanced approach to deficit reduction will help support the American people through job creation, economic growth, and a strong middle class while

responsibly reducing our Nation's debt. House Democrats have proposed balanced solutions that reflect what the American people voted for in November. Instead of considering these or any other proposals, the Tea Party Republicans continue their strategy to obstruct the President so that they can blame him and the Democrats when the economy goes bad. They continue to play politics with this Nation's economy so that they can be well positioned in the upcoming midterm elections in 2014. This is very reckless behavior.

We have 3 more days before sequestration takes effect. Instead of dealing with the sequestration, instead of dealing with gun control, instead of dealing with immigration, instead of dealing with a budget resolution for next year, today, this House of Representatives is dealing with a resolution. So this do-nothing Congress continues, and the American people will suffer.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, thank You for giving us another day.

Be with each of us that we might be our very best and prove ourselves worthy of Your love and Your grace. Be with the Members of this people's House in their work and deliberations this day, that they might merit the trust of the American people and manifest the strength of our democracy to the nations of the world.

Without You, O Lord, we can do nothing. With You and in You, we can establish a world of peace, goodness, and justice now and into the future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we have just 3 days until the sequestration cuts take effect. Instead of being here in Washington working to reach an agreement, the President is off again on the campaign trail. Giving speeches in front of adoring crowds is not going to solve this problem.

In divided government, we don't reach compromise by talking past each other. We come to solutions when we sit down and talk to one another. Obviously, we can't do that when the President isn't even here.

We can find more sensible ways to save billions of dollars. In fact, tomorrow I'm chairing an Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee hearing looking at innovative solutions to combat waste and fraud in Medicare and Medicaid. GAO tells us these programs make \$65 billion in improper payments. Outside groups tell us it can be a nearly \$1 billion-a-year problem. We can also eliminate wasteful programs like the HHS Secretary's duplicative slush fund.

We must get our spending problem under control, but we'll never get a better plan than sequestration if we can't sit down and talk and work together.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that we need to reduce the

size of our deficit, but we have to do it in a responsible way and a way that protects American families. We need to do it in a balanced, forward-thinking way that protects our fragile recovery, continues growing jobs for middle class families, and invests in our long-term economic future.

Sequestration isn't a solution. It's a penalty that will put our recovery in jeopardy and hurt working men and women in my home State of Rhode Island and all across this country.

In the last few weeks, we've seen Members of this Chamber wringing their hands and pointing fingers in order to avoid blame for sequestration. It's time to focus on solutions.

Our colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has offered a proposal that will replace the meat-ax of sequestration with precise, carefully considered changes by enacting responsible cuts in spending, repealing subsidies to big oil companies, implementing the Buffett rule so middle class families don't pay a higher tax rate than millionaires and billionaires, and preserving the Medicare guarantee for our seniors.

After so much conflict and division, let's work together to find an alternative that works for middle class families.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Anniston Army Depot is in my hometown and my district. It serves as a critical installation for our brave warfighters and our Nation.

Now with President Obama's sequester just days away, the depot, along with other vital military installations across our country, faces devastating cuts, possibly resulting in furloughs for already hurting families.

I agree we need to cut spending, and we need to reduce the size of our Federal Government; but I also believe, for our national security and for our warfighters' readiness, we must cut spending in a smarter way.

Friday will mark the beginning of the \$85 billion in Federal cuts across the board this year. I stand here today to urge President Obama to do the right thing: support what the House has done twice and replace these sequester cuts with smarter, more responsible reforms. And let's do it without trying to raise taxes again on the American people in just two months' time.

THE LEGACY OF CARDISS COLLINS, PAST CBC CHAIR

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month we lost a true cham-

pion for women, for communities of color, for the entire country.

Elected in 1973, Congresswoman Cardiss Collins soon became a forceful political voice in the House, rising quickly to become chair of the Congressional Black Caucus in 1979. I came to know and to love Cardiss Collins while working as a staffer to Congressman Ron Dellums.

She opened so many doors for African American women elected to Congress now, serving for a time as one of the only African American women. From 1985 to 1991, she was the only Black woman here in the House of Representatives. She broke so many glass ceilings, oftentimes fighting many, many lonely battles with grace and distinction, knowing her power and her strength.

She was a leader in the fight for low-income women's access to reproductive health services. And she fought tirelessly to ensure that women and minorities were treated equally to their counterparts, especially in college athletics, in the insurance industry, government hiring, and at the Smithsonian.

On behalf of Ron Dellums and his staff, we send our condolences and our prayers.

SEQUESTER

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Obama needs to be truthful with the American people about his sequester. First and foremost, President Obama proposed the sequester.

There's no denying that President Obama's sequester will have devastating effects on Ohio, America's military, and our national security. That's why House Republicans acted twice in 2012 to avoid this situation. But, unfortunately, President Obama chose politics over results. He chose to make campaign speeches rather than work with the Republican-controlled House and Democrat-controlled Senate to find commonsense solutions that would end Washington's spending addiction and bring America's debt under control. This is yet another prime example of President Obama's failure to lead, and it needs to change.

Right now, President Obama's sequester is less than 60 hours away, and he's looking to blame somebody else to distract from his failure to lead. House Republicans stand ready to work with the President on commonsense solutions that work for the American people. President Obama simply needs to come to the table.

□ 1210

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's been 786 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. Congress has instead been consumed by a single-minded focus on the Federal budget deficit. Well, I have news for my colleagues: our real deficit is unemployment.

Unemployment is not only the moral crisis of our time—leaving families homeless and dreams destroyed—but also an underlying cause of our Federal Government's increased levels of borrowing. Massive job losses following the 2008 financial crisis left us with fewer tax receipts and more people requiring benefits. There's ultimately only one responsible way to reduce the Federal deficit: get everyone trained, get everyone retrained, get everyone working, and get everyone contributing to the tax base. Jobs, jobs, jobs should be our mantra.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that President Obama now recognizes his proposed sequester is a meat-ax approach to cutting defense. Just a few months ago, in the third Presidential debate, he told the American people that these cuts were a well-thought-out plan to modernize the military. He said these cuts were nothing more than the equivalent of no longer spending money on horses and bayonets. He was wrong.

He was correct in the State of the Union in saying some in Congress, meaning House Republicans, want to replace these cuts to our defense, but he wants to replace other spending, as well. My colleagues in the House have offered two replacement bills which the Senate has yet to act on.

Let's not use our brave men and women in uniform and civilian workers who serve them as leverage for other spending. The Constitution states that Congress is to provide for our national defense and the President is Commander in Chief.

I ask the Senate and President Obama to join the House in doing its constitutional duty and replace these devastating defense cuts now.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, sequestration will have serious consequences for the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, which is tremendously important to the economy of western New York.

If Congress does not repeal the sequester, the Air Force will have to delay construction of a \$6.1 million flight simulator at the base, a project

that is critical to securing the base's continued operation. There would also be an impact on jobs: 2,300 Air Force civilians in New York will be furloughed, causing \$17.7 million in lost wages across the State.

Mr. Speaker, sequestration was the ransom the Tea Party demanded when it held the American economy hostage over the debt limit. But with 750,000 American jobs at stake, this process will inflict real and permanent damage on the American economy.

Congress created the sequester. Congress can and should repeal it. For the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Base and for our economy, I urge the House to do just that.

TAX INCREASES ARE A LOUSY DEFICIT REDUCTION STRATEGY

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this week's debate about scheduled budget cuts into some much-needed context. The Federal Government spent \$3.5 trillion last year. And yet, even with the \$85 billion in cuts scheduled to occur over the next 7 months, the CBO still projects that Federal spending will be \$15 billion higher this year than last year.

Only in Washington can billions in cuts be made, total spending still increase, and some claim that the problem is that taxes still aren't high enough. The President got his tax increase 7 weeks ago. But the government spent every dime of this year's revenue from that tax increase in just 7 days.

Mr. Speaker, raising taxes is a lousy deficit reduction strategy because in Washington, tax revenue is never dedicated to deficit reduction. Instead, new taxes are always used to finance more government and more spending.

Rather than demand more tax increases as the solution, I encourage everyone to work together to replace the indiscriminate spending cuts with a smarter plan that sets priorities—but which still enacts an equal amount of much-needed spending restraint.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the devastating impacts that the sequester will have on my community, El Paso, Texas. The numbers speak for themselves. Two weeks of furloughs for Customs and Border Patrol officers—that's the equivalent of losing 5,000 border patrol agents and almost 3,000 CBP officers at our ports of entry. Mind you, more than \$450 billion in trade passes through our ports of entry every year. More than 100,000 jobs in my home community depend on the free, secure flow of goods, trade, and people

through our ports of entry, and jobs are at stake.

In addition, 11,000 civilian employees at Fort Bliss in El Paso will be furloughed for 22 days. These are the middle class Americans who care for our wounded warriors when they return from war and make our military base run efficiently. These individuals will be facing a 20 percent cut because Congress cannot muster the courage to come up with a responsible solution.

In addition to these job losses, El Paso children will bear a large burden through the elimination of teachers and classroom aides and Head Start slots.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CARDISS COLLINS, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Cardiss Collins, who died earlier this month, was not the first African American woman elected to the House, but when I was elected in 1990, along with three other Black women, the small number had dwindled to one. Cardiss was alone. Today there are 15, one-third of the Congressional Black Caucus. But Cardiss Collins was more than able to hold the fort by herself.

Although she got the seat when her husband died in a tragic plane crash, Cardiss managed to transform herself from a grieving widow to a highly effective Illinois Congresswoman, chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Democratic whip, and champion of women and minorities.

Cardiss retired in 1997 as the longest-serving Black female in Congress, having gotten 79 percent of the vote in her last election. Cardiss Collins left Congress at the top of her game with a record that will long survive her.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the harmful spending cuts that will threaten our economy and a range of vital services for children, seniors, small businesses, and our men and women in uniform. I've just come from a hearing in the Coast Guard Subcommittee, where we learned that in fiscal year 2011, our already underfunded Coast Guard failed to meet one-fourth of its non-homeland security mission targets and more than half of its homeland security mission targets.

The Coast Guard's ability to protect our homeland and ensure the safety of life at sea will not improve when millions of dollars are cut from the budget. Sequestration will also reduce our mobility in the skies. If we do not act by Friday, the vast majority of the

FAA's 47,000 employees will face extensive furloughs. This will result in longer delays and disruptions at airports, canceled flights, and impeded commerce.

With only 3 days left, our House Republicans must act now to allow a vote on the Democrats' balanced proposal to avert these damaging and indiscriminate spending cuts. We cannot afford to wait a moment longer.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Here we are just days away from the catastrophe that we've known about for months, just days away from a self-inflicted wound to our economy, our credibility, and the American people.

The sequester, these automatic budget cuts, will literally take food out of the mouths of hungry mothers and children—600,000 of them. Air traffic controllers will take a huge hit, increasing wait times by 50 percent. Security lines at LAX could take 4 hours during peak traffic times, as if waits aren't already bad enough. It will eliminate more than 2,000 food inspector jobs. I don't know about you, but I like knowing that I won't get salmonella when I open a can of tuna.

The American people will suffer. And for what? It's not like we couldn't see this coming from a mile away. We did see this coming from a mile away. Enough is enough. It's time for Republicans to join Democrats in a solution, a balanced approach that can avert this freight train.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle complaining about the President's sequester. It is the President that insisted that this sequester be part of the Budget Control Act a year and a half ago. It is the President who has known for 16 months that the sequester was going to happen.

This is why the House acted twice—twice—over the last 300 days to replace the sequester. There are better and smarter ways to cut spending. But the President is out doing his campaign event nonstop when he could be sitting down with Senate leaders to actually act.

The House has acted twice. It's time for the President to put his plan on the table, and it's time for Senate Democrats to put their plan on the table to avert the sequester that's due to go into effect on Friday.

□ 1220

ROSA PARKS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 58 years ago a woman named Rosa Parks took a seat on a bus in Montgomery and refused to give it up.

Tomorrow Rosa Parks will take her place in the Halls of the United States Capitol when her statue joins other great American women like Helen Keller and Sojourner Truth, who stand sentinel over average citizens and Members of Congress alike in this hallowed place, reminding us of the quality of courage and the humble face of justice.

I'm proud to welcome fellow San Pedroan Eugene Daub, the talented artist and sculptor who created this magnificent statue, to the Nation's Capitol. San Pedro is a community for artists in Los Angeles.

It means a lot to San Pedro that a member of our own community was chosen to commemorate the woman whose quiet dignity and defiance inspired a nation to stand up against the daily injustice of Jim Crow. What an honor for Mr. Daub and the entire San Pedro artist community.

Rosa Parks would have been 100 years old this year, but I know that this is only the first century that we will be inspired by her example and this statue.

ACADEMIC COMPETITION
RESOLUTION OF 2013

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Academic Competition Resolution of 2013. The resolution, which will establish a yearly academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics each year in each congressional district, will be much like the long-standing art competition, one in which individuals in the STEM areas—science, mathematics, and engineering—will compete for their best accomplishments.

Art is important; English is important. But today, our greatest shortfalls are in the areas in which these young men and women need to go, need to be interested. Nothing will more promote STEM degrees, the type we need for sciences, for our accomplishments in Silicon Valley and throughout America, than saying it's important enough by an annual competition.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, the American public is tired of the

blame game. They want to see real solutions. Irresponsible, across-the-board spending cuts are not a real solution. If we don't act to avoid these spending cuts, we threaten the very safety of our community and our country.

There will be \$50 million cut from firefighting funding. In my own district, that's \$1.5 million in SAFER grants. Let me translate that. My fire chief, Kurt Henke, says that's the equivalent of one engine company and slower response times. People are going to be unsafe, homes are going to burn. We have to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to lock us in a room and cut a deal. Let's figure out how to avoid sequestration. This is devastating to our economy and our country.

OUR BEST DAYS ARE STILL
AHEAD

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce myself to my new colleagues, some of whom I've not had the chance to meet since joining this distinguished body.

I've served as a high school teacher for 23 years, and I believe the diverse community of the 41st District sent me here because they believe fervently that education is the key to achieving the American Dream. They see a teacher as an emblem of hope.

As a community college trustee for 22 years, I've gained an understanding of the critical role our Nation's community colleges play in workforce training and providing a pathway toward college degrees for middle class families. We must prepare our young people to be the innovators, scientists, and engineers that will keep our economic future strong and secure.

And I'm proud that the people of my district chose to press boldly into the future and make me the first openly gay person of color to serve in the House. As the grandson of an Issei gardener and an Issei small farmer, I stand in the well of this House as the expression of three generations of striving and as a testament to the endurance of the American Dream.

Our Nation's best days are still ahead, and there are many more dreams to be made.

CARDISS COLLINS

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my predecessor, who came to the House basically as an auditor, an accountant, not one who was greatly involved in public activity but quickly learned the ways of the House, became chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus

Foundation, and a leading voice in equity for women in sports.

I lived in the same community that she and her husband lived in, and our community is especially proud of the accomplishments of the honorable Cardiss Collins.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the sequester are broad and far reaching.

Up to 2,600 NOAA employees expect to be furloughed and 2,700 positions not filled, which will affect managing our natural resources and our ability to address climate change.

Climate change is real. According to the Pacific Islands Regional Climate Assessment, across the Pacific Islands region, the frequency and intensity of climate extremes are changing.

Hawaii is usually thought of as a lush, green paradise, but droughts have been more frequent and prolonged. For example, earlier this month the Big Island of Hawaii was declared a natural disaster due to ongoing extreme drought conditions going back to July of 2008. This is causing havoc for our farmers and ranchers. Waikiki, a highly visited and well-known treasure around the world, would be wetlands with beaches gone by the end of the century.

We must take action. We cannot afford to ignore this problem that is currently and will continue to wreak havoc across the globe for generations.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. America is facing some very serious problems, and they're looking to Congress for a solution.

What have we done this week since the sequester is coming on Friday? We had one vote yesterday, and that was to rename a flight center, and we have one vote today. And these are good votes, but just two votes. Friday is looming, and America wants us to answer the sequester.

We heard the Speaker say that they have put two bills before the floor, but they have not been acceptable. We need to compromise.

We also heard the Speaker say recently to the Senate to get going and get moving, and I would suggest that the House should do the same thing. We need to reach out and compromise, find the solution that can pass this House, pass the Senate, and become law.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. CASTRO of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in opposition to the inaction on the sequester.

These across-the-board budget cuts are the direct result of hostage politics, another self-inflicted wound that sabotages our efforts to build out the infrastructure of opportunity in America for so many hardworking and humble people. Inaction should not be an option.

In Texas, this body's inaction will be felt almost immediately. Nearly 100,000 Texans could lose their jobs. Texas schools stand to lose almost \$70 million, putting nearly 1,000 educators out of work and countless children at risk of a disrupted education. More than 50,000 of the folks supporting our military, many of them veterans themselves, could lose 20 percent of their pay in the next year.

The President and Democrats have offered a balanced solution to stop the sequester and reduce our deficit below the historic average. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to allow these proposals to come before the full House. Our communities deserve good-faith action from Congress.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

ACADEMIC COMPETITION RESOLUTION OF 2013

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 77) establishing an academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics among students in Congressional districts.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 77

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Academic Competition Resolution of 2013".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The House of Representatives finds as follows:

(1) STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) fields and knowledge have been integral to the development of civilization over the centuries.

(2) STEM fields have been, and continue to be, vital to a healthy and thriving United States.

(3) STEM fields are even more important in a world and nation of continuous and rapid technological advancements and needs.

(4) STEM fields are necessary to ensure a qualified national workforce and growing American economy, and a recent study predicted that one-half of all STEM jobs in 2020 will be related to the field of computer science.

(5) A recent study found that less than one-third of eighth graders in the United States showed proficiency in mathematics and science.

(6) A recent study found that only 9 States allowed computer science courses to count toward high school students' core graduation requirements.

(7) A recent study found that only one-third of the bachelor's degrees earned in the United States are in a STEM field.

(8) A recent study found that more than one-half of the science and engineering graduate students in institutions of higher education in the United States are from outside the United States.

(9) Efforts to encourage students to work in STEM fields will enhance collaborative efforts between our secondary education systems and STEM-related fields and industries.

(10) The global economy demands that the United States continue to lead the world in innovation, creativity, and STEM-related research.

(11) Bringing together Members of Congress and their younger constituents to participate in activities that will result in a deeper appreciation for STEM fields will foster enthusiasm for education in the sciences.

(12) The support which students will gain through Congressional recognition of their work on STEM-related projects will encourage them to pursue career paths in STEM studies and research.

(13) It is appropriate for the House of Representatives to institute a new and worthwhile competition to encourage students to participate in STEM studies and research.

(14) Rapid technological change means the competition will evolve over time and will challenge students in specialized areas of science, technology, engineering and math to ensure maximum participation. Because of the importance of computer science it would be appropriate to initially challenge students to develop so-called "apps" for mobile, tablet, and computer platforms.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL COMPETITION IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPETITION.—There is hereby established an academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics which shall be held each year among students in each Congressional district.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The competition under this resolution shall be carried out in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, except that the regulations shall permit the office of a Member to seek guidance from outside experts in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics for the purposes of establishing criteria for the selection of competition judges and for the judgment of competition submissions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the House resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in very strong support of House Resolution 77 to establish an academic competition that promotes innovation among students from across the country in the science, technology, engineering, and math—or the "STEM" fields, as they are called.

This program will be modeled after the Congressional Art Competition. This Congressional Academic Competition will be a nationwide STEM innovation competition for participating students in every congressional district. Each year, students will submit STEM projects or programs to their Representatives for consideration. Representatives, Members of Congress, will then select the winning submissions that will be recognized in Washington, D.C., each year. The initial focus of this competition will be software applications. Submissions will likely include smart phone apps, management software programs, and social media technologies.

STEM positions are among the fastest growing occupations. Unfortunately, organizations are having a difficult time filling these positions with qualified and diverse candidates. At least half the growth in the U.S. gross domestic product over the last 50 years has been due to science and engineering. Yet the United States, unfortunately, is losing its competitive edge in those fields. According to a 2010 National Academies report, the United States ranked 27th among developed countries in the proportion of college students earning bachelor's degrees in science or engineering.

As I mentioned, it is our intent to model this program after the Artistic Discovery Competition. I would say, Mr. Speaker, since my arrival here in Congress, I've just marveled at the incredible abilities, the talents, the creativity of young artists from my district, and I have certainly been honored to display the winning submission here in the Capitol building.

I truly believe that the Artistic Discovery has worked to inspire those artists to hone their skills and advance their creativity. This STEM competition, this program that we are talking about today, could do so much more of the same and perhaps help us discover the next Steve Jobs or Bill Gates. This would not only help our young people to thrive, but it would also advance our entire economy.

A study by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology found that, over the next decade, "economic forecasts point to a need for producing approximately 1 million more college graduates in STEM fields than expected."

We are nowhere near meeting that goal, and this competition would be a

no-cost way to further interest in the field. Additionally, fewer than one-third of the eighth graders in the United States show proficiency in science and mathematics. Actually, only nine States allow computer science courses to count toward high school graduation requirements. I know we can do better than that.

We can help America's schools to do more to prepare our children in the STEM fields. We can help to stimulate the workforce by helping America's young people to not only be prepared but to ably fill the STEM jobs in our economy as they are created. It is vital to our economy and to our future that America remain competitive in this growing field. We can encourage and embrace STEM innovation through this bipartisan academic competition.

In an ever-competitive global economy, I know that America's young people can be the world's greatest source of innovation and creativity. We can improve our Nation's economy and help provide countless of our children great opportunities in the future by encouraging their imaginations and by honoring their hard work. If there are STEM jobs available, we must make every effort to ensure that American young people fill these positions.

This competition will help students see the value of STEM fields and engage them with the topics throughout their lives. We also need to help students who are interested in science and engineering maintain that interest so that they can become scientists and engineers. Encouraging greater innovation and participation in STEM fields will help our students and, again, help our Nation to succeed in the future. We know all too well how difficult our economy has been in recent years, but even in this tough economy a lot of these tech industries have flourished. It's important to empower our young people with the necessary tools to succeed when it comes time for them to enter the labor force.

The action that we take today could help empower the next generation because this competition will offer the opportunity for students to expand their horizons and to potentially find interest or maintain their interest in one of our economy's fastest growing occupations. We can improve our students' academic achievements in education in hopes of preparing them for these opportunities in their futures.

As former U.S. Secretary of Education Bill Bennett has said:

As a Nation, we simply must get this message to schools, businesses, corporations, State departments of education, Governors, and beyond. STEM education is an urgent need for our Nation. We cannot continue to graduate students ill-prepared for our Nation's economic necessities—or their own.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this proposed academic competition will inspire and encourage young innovators and better equip our youth to compete in today's global economy.

Far too often, I would note, this House seems to be unable to come to

agreement on ways to solve America's challenges, and I know on this issue we all agree. It's a bipartisan effort. We all love our children. We all want them to succeed. We want them to reach their full potential, and we certainly want to honor their hard work as they reach toward a brighter future. So I would urge all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in supporting this small step toward that brighter future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and her staff for working in a bipartisan fashion on this legislation.

As the chairman mentioned, we created this competition so Members can help promote STEM education in a way that has a direct impact on their constituents. It is this very type of learning that will be essential to continue revitalizing our Nation's economy. The time and energy we invest now in advancing STEM education will only strengthen our Nation's economic posture in the future. This competition is one small way to do that.

I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman as we develop regulations for this program and implement this competition.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), who has been a principal force and advocate for this particular piece of legislation in the STEM.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House's efforts to promote entrepreneurship and innovation through a new nationwide Congressional Academic Competition focused on science, technology, engineering, and math. From Robert Noyce to Sergey Brin, America has long been at the forefront of the digital revolution. Yet the United States faces an increasing challenge in terms of competitiveness and the opportunities available to future generations.

This competition will provide a unique opportunity for America's high school and college students in each congressional district to showcase their capabilities and creativity and build a framework for American success. Each year, this competition will bring communities together with their Members of Congress to recognize the importance of innovation and motivate students to pursue their ideas, take risks and put forward innovative solutions.

By challenging students to explore the importance of computer science in their everyday lives, we hope that this competition will help empower them to use their creativity to code for a more prosperous and innovative community. This competition will initially focus on

developing applications for mobile, tablet, and computer platforms, reviewed by community leaders and entrepreneurs in these fields. However, given that technology rapidly changes over time, the competition has been designed with the ability to evolve for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member BRADY, and their staffs for their hard work in making this program possible. It will be exciting to see the kinds of advancements and breakthroughs students will come up with across the country.

I look forward to the success of the Congressional Academic Competition for years to come, and I encourage my colleagues to support this effort to inspire the next generation of American innovators.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, ANNA ESHOO.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the ranking member for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Academic Competition Resolution of 2013, which is really the first step toward establishing a mobile apps contest for students across America, which I find very, very exciting.

□ 1240

Building on the success of the Congressional Arts Competition, which for more than 30 years has recognized and encouraged artistic talent among our Nation's youth, an apps competition will foster interest in STEM education—science, technology, engineering, and math—which is just what our country needs to prepare for our future.

According to the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, in the next decade there will be approximately 8.5 million STEM job opportunities; but during the same time, it is projected we'll face a shortage of 1 million STEM graduates. We need to address this mismatch by encouraging our children's innate curiosity and creativity. And what better way to do so than through a mobile apps competition? From mobile medical apps that can revolutionize the way we seek and receive health care to apps that enable video conferencing and the streaming of online video, our lives have been changed forever by the mobility and the economic impact that these apps have provided.

Studies show the app economy has already created approximately 150,000 jobs in my State of California alone, and over half a million jobs nationwide, so there is a huge economic benefit already, but we need to leverage this.

So I thank Chairwoman MILLER; I thank the ranking member of the committee, and I want to acknowledge my wonderful colleague, Chairman GOODLATTE, who heads up the House Congressional Internet Caucus, and I'm proud to be a cochair with him. We

look forward to working with the committee to ensure that the success of this competition and the continued growth of the app marketplace takes place.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA), who is also the distinguished cochair of the STEM Education Caucus.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and commend Chairwoman MILLER and Ranking Member BRADY for offering this thoughtful legislation.

As cochair of the STEM Education Caucus, I'm grateful the House has brought forth this issue which is critical to American economic competitiveness. In order to rebuild our middle class, increase our standard of living, and ensure that the 21st century is another prosperous American century, one of the most important things that Congress can do is prioritize science, technology, engineering, and math.

I'm a member of the Joint Economic Committee, which reported last year that STEM fields spur economic growth through innovation and value-added tradable goods. We also know that STEM unemployment rates are half of the normal unemployment rate. STEM salaries are double what other salaries are for non-STEM work. Putting people solidly in the middle class creates taxpayers, which grows our economy and helps control our debt, ensuring that the increasingly elusive American Dream is still attainable.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution to establish academic STEM competitions in each of our districts is a great way to highlight the importance of educating our youth in fields which are so necessary to the future competitiveness of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I look forward to this House continuing to find bipartisan ways to prioritize science, technology, engineering, and math education.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I congratulate the chairwoman and my friend, Mr. BRADY, for bringing to the floor very good legislation that recognizes the value of the best and brightest young Americans competing in the fields of math, science, and innovation.

But America is not going to compete very well if we don't solve the budget sequester that surrounds us here today. We're in a global economic competition where we will fall behind if we do not act by this Friday. Beginning this Friday, according to economists, a conservative estimate of the number of jobs lost in our country will be 750,000. There are those who believe that the job loss may exceed 2 million jobs.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, there is a proposal in the well before the House that would postpone this job loss. Mr. VAN HOLLEN has offered a proposal that would postpone the sequester and save these jobs and still reduce our deficit by cutting subsidies to huge oil companies who do not need those subsidies, by cutting subsidies to huge agribusinesses who do not need those subsidies, by saying that people who make more than \$2 million a year should pay a rate of taxation that does not let them exploit loopholes and other deductions.

To date, with the sequester looming, the majority in this House has done nothing to address this problem—not one bill, not one hour, not one debate, not one vote. So we have an alternative, and with this looming problem facing the people of the country, I believe that should be the order of business of the House today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN's bill would end the sequester and reduce the deficit; so I therefore ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 699 at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. ANDREWS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the result of the Chair's ruling that the House will not be able to vote on a bill to end the sequester at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as the Internet Caucus, and a cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank Chairwoman MILLER for bringing this legislation forward and for the hard work of both herself and Congressman BRADY on this issue, and I rise in support of the Academic Competition Resolution of 2013.

This resolution establishes an academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, STEM, which shall be held each year among students in each congressional district, and allows the Committee on House Administration to prescribe the regulations that will govern this competition.

This resolution will allow the Congressional Internet Caucus the ability to create the first Congressional App Challenge. Modeled after the Congressional Art Competition, the Congressional App Challenge promotes STEM

learning and innovation by recognizing and incentivizing America's young programming talent.

In the 17 years since the formation of the Congressional Internet Caucus, technology policy issues ranging from cybersecurity and intellectual property have gained more prominence with each passing Congress. This challenge allows Members to experience the technology, innovation, and entrepreneurship that take place on a daily basis in their own districts. This firsthand knowledge will be able to serve as a resource to Members as they consider legislation dealing with technology issues.

This competition will motivate our young people to further pursue programming and other technology-related educational opportunities. It will also enable them to showcase their programming skills on a national stage while at the same time promoting the value of STEM education and careers.

I want to thank the chair of the Committee on House Administration, Congresswoman MILLER, and Ranking Member BRADY for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I look forward to working with them to craft regulations that will make the congressional app contest a huge success to both Members and our constituents. I also look forward to working with my Congressional Internet Caucus cochair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), in bringing this competition to fruition.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of House Resolution 77. And I commend the chair of the committee and the ranking member for bringing this to the floor, and I hope that all of our colleagues will participate in this competition for students in STEM subjects to create these apps and to further, hopefully, their careers in STEM.

But I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am also deeply worried that our hopes to increase the number of students who will participate in STEM education and become part of the STEM careers that are available to them that this Nation so desperately needs could all be for naught, this resolution and all of our efforts, if on Friday we are not able to set aside the sequester and make a balanced proposal to reduce the deficit and to provide for the ongoing needs of this Nation.

□ 1250

Right now, if we do nothing between now and Friday, there will be a \$740 million cut to title I, impacting over 1 million students, low-income students, and 9,000 teachers and staff jobs. Those are the people that we want to encourage to go into STEM. Those are the very same students that have a 1 in 7 chance of having a qualified teacher

teach them mathematics or science in their schools. So the very population that you're trying to encourage will have less of a chance because of sequestration.

Over \$600 million cuts for students with disabilities, eliminating some 7,800 teacher and staff jobs with respect to those students.

For those students who are trying to acquire the English language so they can participate in STEM careers and STEM academics, nearly 210,000 children and 450 teachers would be eliminated by the sequestration. And the same goes with community learning centers, where it's an opportunity to expose these students, after school and in additional time, to these careers, to these opportunities, to the applications and to the Web sites that are available to them that they can't use during class time.

But, finally, there is even a more direct harm that will be done by sequestration, and that is that the National Science Foundation would issue nearly 1,000 fewer research grants and awards, impacting an estimated 12,000 scientists and students and curtailing critical scientific research. That's the scientific research that builds this Nation.

And for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the House now take up H.R. 699, a balanced approach introduced by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, to replace the sequestration and save jobs and avoid these cuts in education that are so desperately needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, does that mean that we will not be taking up sequestration between now and Friday so that we can get rid of the sequestration with a balanced plan?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, but I would reserve the balance of my time if my ranking member would like to close, to make his final statement.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Yes, I'd just like to also deviate, for a moment or two, on our issue here. Tomorrow we will be honoring Rosa Parks with a statue. And as our Chairman MILLER can start to understand, being the chairman of the committee, we won't get an opportunity to say

anything, but it is our committee that had this happen.

I would like to thank Mr. Lungren, the former chairman and ranking member of our committee. Because of that we will be honoring Rosa Parks in Statuary Hall tomorrow, which we would not, again, have a chance to say that.

I would like to thank, also, Jesse Jackson. Without his efforts every single day, every week, pushing to have that statue done, we would not be in that Hall tomorrow honoring her. So I need to give credit where credit belongs, and I appreciate the moment to be able to say that.

Again, I wish to thank the chair for her cooperation on this bill. I look forward to working with her as we implement the program's regulations.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, first of all, would like to associate myself with the remarks about Rosa Parks that my ranking member just made. You think about one person with that act of courage literally changing a Nation, and it's a remarkable thing. And we were very proud in Michigan that she came to be a resident of Michigan in her final years, where she served, as you can imagine, so extraordinarily well and so inspiring to so many people. It's certainly entirely appropriate that a statue to her takes a place in Statuary Hall amongst Presidents and other national leaders. And so we're all looking forward to it tomorrow, to that unveiling of her statue.

But getting back to the House resolution that we have today, Mr. Speaker, I would just say, in closing, that certainly if America wants to remain competitive, we have to encourage and embrace innovation in the STEM fields. And as all of the various speakers have mentioned today, this program, I'm very excited about it. I have to tell you, in full transparency, 5 years ago I didn't even know what an app was. Now it's part of the nomenclature. You've got an app store and there's apps for all kinds of things. And these kids, when you get a chance to go into these high schools and talk to them, have ideas for apps doing all kinds of things.

And so I think that we're going to try to design this program to be technology neutral, whether it's a smartphone or a Web site or a laptop or any kind of software, and then sort of leave it open, because the technology is just changing so rapid fire as well.

We've thought about, for instance, in my district I've talked to my staff about how we would have a panel of judges that are very savvy on all of these things. You could use computer science teachers to be part of the judging panel, people from industry, academics, what have you.

And then, I think, hopefully as some of the students come forward, whether

they win or not, that we would have some sort of a mentoring program, as well, where folks from the industry, from the academics and the sciences in the STEM programs in the fields could talk to these students about opportunities, job possibilities, et cetera.

So I do think that this resolution that we're passing today, again, in a bipartisan way, is very important and does have the ability to really impact in a very positive way.

With that, I have no further requests for time, so I would urge my colleagues to support the legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 77, the Academic Competition Resolution of 2013.

As a businessman, manufacturer and physicist, I know how important it is that we support STEM education. Throughout the twentieth century, American-led advancements in the STEM fields have driven forward our collective human understanding of the universe and strengthened the American economy.

The future of the American economy will depend on our ability to prepare graduates for work in STEM-related fields. Last year, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology estimated that for the U.S. to maintain its position at the forefront of STEM fields, we will need to increase the number of American STEM graduates by one million students over the next decade.

The economic crisis has further highlighted the importance of STEM education, as the STEM fields weathered the downturn better than most. As the Joint Economic Committee on STEM education points out, the unemployment rate among STEM workers never surpassed 5.5% during the crisis, while unemployment in non-STEM fields grew to almost 10% in 2010. STEM workers also enjoy higher average wages than their non-STEM counterparts.

A congressionally-sponsored academic competition in the STEM fields will generate enthusiasm in this burgeoning field and provide an opportunity for students to work on meaningful, hands-on projects. Congress must do more to support educational initiatives that will prepare our students for participation in a dynamic, global economy, and sponsoring a STEM competition is a small step in the right direction.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 77, the Academic Competition Resolution of 2013. For years, the annual art competition sponsored by the U.S. House of Representatives recognizes imaginative high school students from every congressional district in the United States. Like the congressional art competition, H. Res. 77 establishes an academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) to be held each year among students in each congressional district across the country.

It is just and appropriate for the United States House of Representatives to incentivize STEM education by highlighting outstanding youth across our country who are excelling in these disciplines. The highest growth sectors, such as information technology, require a workforce proficient in STEM. Producing students with the STEM skills needed to fill the jobs of the future is necessary to maintaining

our nation's innovation capacity and creating new high-skill, high-paying jobs at home. As Ranking Member of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, I know that to strengthen our nation's technological workforce and infrastructure we must encourage and incentivize STEM education.

Mr. Speaker, as we rise in support of H. Res. 77 to encourage STEM education and American innovation, with the fiscal cliff looming I would be remiss if I did not warn against cutting our critical federal R&D investments. As we struggle with our own deficits, we too can make the strategic choice to continue to invest in our future—both in our human capital and physical infrastructure—or we can make the strategic choice to permanently cede our leadership, to fail our current generation of young people, and to put our economy in a state of stagnation for years to come. It is when our economy is hurting the most that we should be redoubling our efforts to innovate our way into a brighter future of new jobs, new technologies, and untold societal benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 77.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 3 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the house do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by 5-minute votes on

the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 77; and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 1, nays 415, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—1

Reichert

NAYS—415

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flore
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt

Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney

Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall

Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohy
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Barton
Bilirakis
Cartwright
Coble
Culberson

Lucas
Lynch
Maffei
Pittenger
Richmond

□ 1524

Messrs. SESSIONS, CAMPBELL, HARPER, COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. NADLER and HUFFMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Messrs. RUSH and WHITFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 48 I mistakenly voted "yea." I meant to vote "nay."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to reiterate the announcement of January 23, 2012, concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential to maintaining order and deliberacy in the House. The Chair

believes that a few of these principles bear emphasis today.

Members should refrain from trafficking the well when another—including the presiding officer—is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor might be.

Members who wish to speak on the floor should respectfully seek and obtain recognition from the presiding officer, taking the time to do so in proper form, including 1-minutes. The proper form would be to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Members should take care to yield and reclaim time in an orderly fashion, bearing in mind that the Official Reporters of Debate cannot properly transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

Members should not embellish the offering of a motion, the entry of a request, the making of a point of order, or the entry of an appeal with any statement of motive or other commentary, and should be aware that such utterances could render the motion, request, point of order, or appeal untimely.

Members should attempt to come to the floor to vote within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells. The Members should know that if the Member is in the aisle, is in the Chamber, they are entitled to vote. But as a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, trying to be on time within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of the institution.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will ensure against personal confrontation, among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members' comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. It will enable accurate transcriptions of proceedings. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

ACADEMIC COMPETITION RESOLUTION OF 2013

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 77) establishing an academic competition in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics among students in Congressional districts, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—411

Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Alexander	Davis, Danny	Himes
Amodi	Davis, Rodney	Hinojosa
Andrews	DeFazio	Holding
Bachmann	DeGette	Holt
Bachus	Delaney	Honda
Barber	DeLauro	Horsford
Barletta	DelBene	Hoyer
Barr	Denham	Hudson
Barrow (GA)	Dent	Huelskamp
Barton	DeSantis	Huffman
Bass	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Beatty	Deutch	Hultgren
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Benishek	Dingell	Hurt
Bentivolio	Doggett	Israel
Bera (CA)	Doyle	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Bishop (NY)	Duffy	Jeffries
Black	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	Edwards	Johnson (OH)
Bonamici	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Bonner	Ellmers	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Engel	Jones
Brady (PA)	Enyart	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Eshoo	Joyce
Braley (IA)	Esty	Kaptur
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Keating
Brooks (AL)	Farr	Kelly
Brooks (IN)	Fattah	Kennedy
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Fleischmann	Kind
Buchanan	Fleming	King (IA)
Bucshon	Flores	King (NY)
Burgess	Forbes	Kingston
Bustos	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Butterfield	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Calvert	Fox	Kline
Camp	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Capito	Fudge	Lamborn
Capps	Gabbard	Lance
Capuano	Galleo	Langevin
Cardenas	Garamendi	Lankford
Carney	Garcia	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Gardner	Larson (CT)
Carter	Garrett	Latham
Cartwright	Gerlach	Latta
Cassidy	Gibbs	Lee (CA)
Castor (FL)	Gibson	Levin
Castro (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis
Chabot	Gohmert	Lipinski
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Chu	Gosar	Loeb
Ciulline	Gowdy	Lofgren
Clarke	Granger	Long
Clay	Graves (GA)	Lowenthal
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Lowey
Clyburn	Grayson	Luetkemeyer
Coffman	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Cohen	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cole	Griffin (AR)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Collins (GA)	Griffith (VA)	(NM)
Collins (NY)	Grijalva	Lummis
Conaway	Grimm	Maloney,
Connolly	Guthrie	Carolyn
Conyers	Gutierrez	Maloney, Sean
Cook	Hahn	Marchant
Cooper	Hall	Marino
Costa	Hanabusa	Markey
Cotton	Harper	Matheson
Courtney	Harris	Matsui
Cramer	Hartzler	McCarthy (CA)
Crawford	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCaul
Crowley	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Cuellar	Heck (WA)	McCollum
Cummings	Hensarling	McDermott
Daines	Herrera Beutler	McGovern

McHenry	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Smith (TX)
McKeon	Quigley	Smith (WA)
McKinley	Radel	Southerland
McMorris	Rahall	Speier
Rodgers	Rangel	Stewart
McNerney	Reed	Stivers
Meadows	Reichert	Stockman
Meehan	Renacci	Stutzman
Meeks	Rice (SC)	Swalwell (CA)
Meng	Roby	Takano
Messer	Roe (TN)	Terry
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Tiberi
Miller, George	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Moore	Roskam	Tipton
Moran	Ross	Titus
Mullin	Rothfus	Tonko
Mulvaney	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Murphy (FL)	Royce	Turner
Murphy (PA)	Ruiz	Upton
Nadler	Runyan	Valadao
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Neal	Rush	Vargas
Negrete McLeod	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Vela
Nolan	Salmon	Visclosky
Nugent	Sanchez, Linda	Wagner
Nunes	T.	Walberg
Nunnelee	Sanchez, Loretta	Walden
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Walorski
Olson	Scalise	Walz
Owens	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Palazzo	Schiff	Schultz
Pallone	Schneider	Waters
Pascarella	Schock	Watt
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Waxman
Paulsen	Schwartz	Weber (TX)
Payne	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Welch
Pelosi	Scott, David	Wenstrup
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Perry	Serrano	Whitfield
Peters (CA)	Sessions	Williams
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Sherman	Wittman
Pingree (ME)	Shimkus	Wolf
Pitts	Shuster	Womack
Pocan	Simpson	Woodall
Poe (TX)	Sinema	Yarmuth
Polis	Sires	Yoder
Pompeo	Slaughter	Yoho
Posey	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash	Massie	Ribble
Bilirakis	Lynch	Rokita
Bishop (UT)	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Coble	Neugebauer	Velázquez
Culberson	Pittenger	Young (AK)
Hanna	Richmond	Young (FL)
Lucas	Rigell	

□ 1538

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 118, answered “present” 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—290

Aderholt Fudge Nadler
 Alexander Gabbard Napolitano
 Bachmann Gallego Negrete McLeod
 Bachus Garamendi Neugebauer
 Barber Garcia Noem
 Barletta Garrett Nunes
 Barrow (GA) Gerlach Nunnelee
 Barton Gibbs O'Rourke
 Beatty Gingrey (GA) Olson
 Becerra Goodlatte Palazzo
 Bera (CA) Gosar Pascrell
 Bishop (GA) Gowdy Payne
 Bishop (UT) Granger Pelosi
 Black Grayson Perlmutter
 Blackburn Green, Al Perry
 Blumenauer Griffith (VA) Petri
 Bonamici Grimm Pingree (ME)
 Bonner Guthrie Pocan
 Boustany Hahn Polis
 Brady (TX) Hall Pompeo
 Braley (IA) Hanabusa Posey
 Bridenstine Harper Price (NC)
 Brooks (AL) Harris Quigley
 Brooks (IN) Hastings (WA) Radel
 Broun (GA) Heck (WA) Rangel
 Brown (FL) Hensarling Rice (SC)
 Brownley (CA) Higgins Roby
 Buchanan Himes Rogers (AL)
 Buehson Hinojosa Rogers (MI)
 Bustos Holt Rohrabacher
 Butterfield Huelskamp Rokita
 Calvert Huffman Rooney
 Camp Huizenga (MI) Ros-Lehtinen
 Campbell Hultgren Roskam
 Cantor Hunter Ross
 Capito Hurt Rothfus
 Capps Issa Roybal-Allard
 Carney Johnson, Sam Royce
 Carson (IN) Jones Ruiz
 Cartwright Joyce Runyan
 Cassidy Kaptur Ruppersberger
 Castro (TX) Keating Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Kelly Scalise
 Chaffetz Kennedy Schiff
 Chu Kildee Schneider
 Cicilline King (IA) Schock
 Cleaver King (NY) Schrader
 Clyburn Kingston Schwartz
 Cohen Kline Schweikert
 Cole Kuster Scott, Austin
 Collins (GA) Labrador Scott, David
 Collins (NY) LaMalfa Sensenbrenner
 Conaway Lamborn Serrano
 Connolly Lankford Sessions
 Cook Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter
 Cooper Larson (CT) Sherman
 Crawford Levin Shimkus
 Crenshaw Lipinski Shuster
 Cuellar Loeb sack Simpson
 Cummings Lofgren Smith (NE)
 Daines Long Smith (NJ)
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal Smith (TX)
 Davis, Danny Luetkemeyer Smith (WA)
 DeGette Lujan Grisham Southerland
 Delaney (NM) Speier
 DeLauro Luján, Ben Ray Stivers
 DelBene (NM) Stockman
 DeSantis Maloney, Stutzman
 DesJarlais Carolyn Swallow (CA)
 Deutch Maloney, Sean Thompson (PA)
 Diaz-Balart Marino Thornberry
 Dingell Markey Tiberi
 Doggett Massie Tierney
 Doyle McCarthy (CA) Titus
 Duckworth McCarthy (NY) Tonko
 Duncan (SC) McCaul Tsongas
 Duncan (TN) McClintock Upton
 Ellison McCollum Van Hollen
 Ellmers McHenry Vargas
 Engel McIntyre Wagner
 Enyart McKeon Walden
 Eshoo McMorris Walorski
 Esty Rodgers Walz
 Farenthold McNERney Wasserman
 Farr Meadows Schultz
 Fattah Meng Waters
 Fincher Messer Watt
 Fleischmann Michaud Waxman
 Fleming Miller (FL) Weber (TX)
 Flores Miller (MI) Webster (FL)
 Forbes Miller, Gary Welch
 Fortenberry Moran Wenstrup
 Foster Mullin Westmoreland
 Frankel (FL) Mulvaney Whitfield
 Franks (AZ) Murphy (FL) Williams
 Frelinghuysen Murphy (PA) Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
WolfWomack
Yarmuth
Yoho

Young (IN)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2013.Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Office of the Speaker, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

MR. SPEAKER, In light of my recent appointment to the House Ways and Means Committee, I hereby resign my position on both the House Budget Committee and the House Committee on Financial Services.

Best Regards,

CONGRESSMAN JIM RENACCI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AND COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2013.Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Capitol,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for supporting my appointment to serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to serve on the Appropriations Committee.

I understand that in order to facilitate this appointment, I am required to resign from my current committee assignments. As a result, this letter is to resign my membership on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ANDY HARRIS, M.D.,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2013.Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter is to notify you of my interest in stepping down from the House Committee on Agriculture so that I can dedicate additional focus to my other committee assignments and legislative responsibilities. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

STEVE SOUTHERLAND II,
Member of Congress.

NAYS—118

Amash Herrera Beutler
 Andrews Holding
 Barr Honda
 Bass Horsford
 Benishek Hoyer
 Bentivolio Hudson
 Bishop (NY) Israel
 Brady (PA) Jackson Lee
 Burgess Jeffries
 Capuano Jenkins
 Cárdenas Johnson (OH)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke Jordan
 Clay Kilmer
 Coffman Kind
 Conyers Kinzinger (IL)
 Costa Kirkpatrick
 Cotton Lance
 Courtney Langevin
 Crowley Latham
 Davis, Rodney Latta
 DeFazio Lee (CA)
 Denham Lewis
 Dent LoBiondo
 Duffy Lowey
 Edwards Lummis
 Fitzpatrick Marchant
 Foxx Matheson
 Gardner Matsui
 Gibson McDermott
 Graves (GA) McGovern
 Graves (MO) McKinley
 Green, Gene Meehan
 Griffin (AR) Meeks
 Grijalva Miller, George
 Gutierrez Moore
 Hanna Neal
 Hartzler Nolan
 Hastings (FL) Nugent
 Heck (NV) Pallone

Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Price (GA)
 Rahall
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Roe (TN)
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Sewell (AL)
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tipton
 Turner
 Valadao
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Woodall
 Yoder

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei Lucas
 Bilirakis Lynch
 Carter Maffei
 Coble Mica
 Cramer Pittenger
 Culberson Richmond
 Gohmert Rigell
 Johnson (GA) Rogers (KY)

□ 1545

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 48 on a motion to adjourn, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 49 on H. Res. 77, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 50 on approving the Journal, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1550

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Financial Services:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.J. Res. 19

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.J. Res. 19, a measure originally introduced by Representative Emerson of Missouri, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it's been almost 300 days since the House first acted to replace sequestration with targeted reforms that achieve the same level of deficit reduction without harming the economy, yet the Senate has failed to act.

The administration states that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is set to feel the impact of sequestration more than most States yet has offered no constructive plan forward.

The House has put forward two concrete proposals for a commonsense path to deficit reduction that will not harm our national security and will not harm our fragile economic recovery.

We all must make sacrifices in order to reduce the debt and fix Washington, for we can no longer spend \$1 trillion more than we take in each year. Raising taxes to chase after trillion dollar deficits, as the President suggests, is a recipe for economic decline. Spending is the problem.

It's time for the President to stop campaigning and call on the Democratized Senate to act. No more 11th-hour negotiations; no more unnecessary harm to families and small businesses. It's time for us to come together and work on serious solutions.

PROTECTING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FROM THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. PETERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I visited the Salk Institute, a cutting-edge biological research facility whose work has contributed to San Diego's status as the number two life science cluster in the United States. At Salk, I met Dr. Geoff Wahl, a professor who leads a groundbreaking cancer research lab,

and Bianca Kennedy, a breast cancer advocate and survivor.

In fiscal year 2012, San Diego firms received more than \$130 million from the National Science Foundation and \$850 million from the National Institutes of Health. It's these types of investments that have created hundreds of thousands of jobs and bolstered our economy, contributing also to the quality of life for people around the world.

The sequester threatens to undo this progress. The immediate cuts to NIH from sequestration are 8.2 percent, which is equivalent to a cut of \$2.5 billion. This could result in the loss of 33,000 research-related jobs in 2013 and a \$4.5 billion decrease in economic activity.

Let's work together to avert the sequester so we can continue to improve the lives of patients and lead the world in science and technology.

WAYZATA GIRLS NORDIC SKI TEAM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Wayzata High School girls Nordic ski team.

For the first time in 33 years, the Wayzata girls Nordic skiing program claimed the very top prize at the State competition earlier this month in northern Minnesota.

Wayzata head coach Larry Myers lauded his team's attitude and morale as key to their success this season and at the State competition, but special congratulations also should go out to junior Alayna Sonnesyn and sophomore Anna French, who earned all-State honors at the meet.

Six students from Wayzata's State championship Nordic ski team also were members of the State championship cross-country running squad that captured a State championship title last fall. Each of these student athletes, their parents, and their coaches deserve praise for their dedication and determination.

It's an honor to be able to represent and recognize such great student athletes and the Wayzata School District. Congratulations.

STOP THE SEQUESTER

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on this coming Friday, March 1, we are going to see budget cuts that will devastate Federal workers, programs, agencies, and private sector contractors. This pending \$85 billion in cuts for this fiscal year alone was intended to be so bad, just so horrible, and cause such widespread damage that they were never intended to take effect in the first place. Yet here we are with an-

other self-inflicted wound as House Republicans continue to ignore Democrats' requests to find a sensible alternative.

In Maryland alone, sequestration will hurt families, including 800 children who will lose access to school readiness programs; 2,100 fewer children receiving lifesaving vaccinations; 12,000 mothers and young children cut from Women, Infants, and Children programs; and 46,000 civilian private sector workers are going to be furloughed. And the list goes on in Maryland and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, the GOP, the Republicans rule the roost here in the House, and they can stop these senseless cuts today. It's in their power and the power of the GOP to stop the cuts that are going to cost 900,000 jobs and threaten economic recession. The American people deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I also ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentlewoman's request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

□ 1600

THE INABILITY TO GOVERN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, sequestration is a bad idea. I voted "no."

The idea for the sequester came from White House advisers. The President quickly signed the sequester and made it the law of the land. Now he has buyer's remorse. The House, in seeing the error of its ways, repented, and two times replaced the sequestration with rational cuts. The President's siesta Senate, however, ignored the House legislation and went missing in action.

Rather than administer with a smidge less taxpayer money, the President blames others for his fate. This is in spite of his power to determine priorities in spending, so he says the sky is falling because his government cannot operate without more money. He does not have the ability to produce a balanced budget or cut back waste, duplication, inefficiency, or fluff.

As the sequester is upon us, it is time for the President to lead America and govern with less money, but the President only knows one way to rule—tax more, spend more, and scare the people more. This is the inability to govern.

And that's just the way it is.

WE MUST AVOID THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, we now have only a matter of days to prevent serious damage to the U.S. economy by the so-called "sequester."

These mindless, across-the-board cuts will hurt the country and my home State of Nevada. There has been a lot of talk that these cuts won't be that bad, but let me tell you about just one school in my district that I visited last week, the Matt Kelly Elementary Empowerment School.

In terms of funding, over 50 percent of its school allocation is title I funding. It is a high-achieving, five-star school, where teachers are doing the best that they can with the little money that they receive, but the sequester would hit them hard. They would have to cut back on full-day kindergarten, fire teachers' aides, eliminate reading and math intervention programs for struggling students, reduce meals to hungry kids, and defund their family community center.

This is a model school that is working hard to improve our students' academic achievement. Now, as their reward, because some in this body can't come to agreement, Congress will take a sledgehammer to their budget.

The sequester is not fair to the children and families in my district. It is not about trimming fat. It is about the children, and that's who we should focus on today in this House.

THE SEQUESTER LOOMS

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. The sequester looms. Programs are going to be cut, and people are going to suffer—and what has this House done today under the Republican leadership? We've passed three bills. We've brought up three bills, one of which is a motion to adjourn, and the other one is a vote on the Journal. What a shame and what a disgrace.

I didn't vote for the sequester law. I thought it was not a good idea—but we have it. The only way we're going to get away from it is if we have a combination of cutting spending and raising revenues.

The President has been fair. He wants to sit down with Republicans and have a balanced bill and close the tax loopholes for Big Oil and other people who have these loopholes but who don't need them. Let the people who can afford to pay more pay a little more. It has got to be a combination.

The American people want us to reach out and meet in the middle. Unfortunately, the Republicans have refused to budge. This is not good for the American people. This is not something that we should be doing. Close the tax loopholes on Big Oil. The American people want to see a compromise.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the

sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, we are just days away from an \$85 billion sequester that will result in arbitrary, devastating cuts to our Federal Government.

Despite the looming deadline, this House has not debated any alternative to protect programs that benefit this country's most vulnerable populations—our seniors, our students, and our middle class. Our fiscal house may be in disarray, but targeted decisions, not wholesale cuts, are needed.

This is the opportunity to come together—for both sides to roll up their sleeves and find a way forward. This is the moment to take a balanced, measured approach to deficit reduction that reduces spending thoughtfully and increases revenue responsibly. I know there is common ground between the sides; but it won't be found unless, together, Democrats and Republicans get to the table and prevent these across-the-board, irresponsible cuts. No two programs are the same, and no difficult decision should be made without thoughtful deliberation. There is no excuse for not sitting down and bridging the gap. Hardworking families everywhere are counting on it.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Here we go again. Our Nation is on the brink of disaster because Congress has created another manmade disaster. Let me repeat—not Congress. House Republicans have created another manmade disaster. I haven't talked with anyone—from business leaders, to children's advocates, to AARP and senior citizen groups—who think Congress is doing a good job.

Just last year, the Republicans took \$115 billion and handed it over to 6,000 of the wealthiest Americans in the form of tax cuts. At the same time, they cut health care funding for needy children and their families. I have a list of cuts and how they're going to affect children, senior citizens, and the FAA.

Do you know what? You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

In closing, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace this cutting and spending disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. I rise today to speak out against this manufactured monster that we know as sequestration—across-the-board cuts that hurt our economy and jeopardize our families.

In small-town west Texas, when there is a fire, everyone works together to put the fire out, and no one focuses on how the fire started or who started the fire until after the fire is out. Here and now in Washington, many folks are more focused on who is to blame for the sequester than in trying to do anything about it or, worse, they use inflammatory rhetoric to add fuel to the fire.

Meanwhile, here is what Texas is facing: 159,000 jobs lost; more than 16,000 Air Force personnel furloughed, hurting Laughlin Air Force Base in Del Rio and Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio; 11,000 civilian employees at Fort Bliss, who could be furloughed in El Paso—and the biggest single threat to border security, that would be sequestration.

I represent the district with the largest border—Del Rio, Eagle Pass, Presidio, Fabens. Here, Border Patrol overtime is canceled, and workers are being furloughed. If you thought the lines of the border were long before, just wait.

Mr. Speaker, not having a vote this week is a decision by some in Congress for decreased border security, job loss and furloughs; and it devastates local communities and the State of Texas.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 82

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—Mr. Fincher, to rank immediately after Mr. Denham.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Mr. Harris.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—Mr. Price of Georgia, to rank immediately after Mr. Cole; Mrs. Black, to rank immediately after Mr. Lankford; and Mr. Duffy.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS—Mr. Renacci.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1610

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to join in this Special Order, a bipartisan one, in which I thank my judiciary colleague and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JIM SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin, for joining me in this discussion, as well as Congressman BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia, also a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Members of the House, just days before the anniversary of the Edmund Pettus Bridge march from Montgomery to Selma—and by the way, our colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, was the only Member of Congress who was in that march—the Supreme Court will review Congress' authority under the Constitution to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, specifically section 5 of that act. I believe and I am confident the Supreme Court will and should uphold the constitutionality of Congress' authorization of section 5 for three reasons. The first: Protecting minority voting rights is a constitutional imperative that Congress is required to enforce.

When Congress acts under the 15th Amendment to the Constitution, it acts at the zenith of its constitutional authority. The Supreme Court has consistently upheld Congress' authority under the 15th Amendment. The 15th Amendment gives Congress a mandate to eliminate racial discrimination in voting by appropriate legislation. After almost a century of ineffective protection for minorities, and in the long wake of the Civil War, Congress took action to pass the 15th Amendment, and almost a hundred years later passed the Voting Rights Act, which included section 5. Protecting minority voting rights is something Congress can do, and this authority has been repeatedly affirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

For almost 50 years, the Supreme Court consistently affirmed Congress'

authority to protect minority voting rights under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Legal challenges to section 5 are nothing new to Congress, and are nothing new to the Court. Legal challenges to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act have routinely been made after Congress has reauthorized temporary provisions.

The Supreme Court first affirmed the constitutionality of section 5 in 1966. In the case of *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, the Supreme Court upheld the Voting Rights Act, including section 5. The Court in that decision cited Congress' careful study and the voluminous legislative history underlying the Voting Rights Act as the basis for upholding it. During Congress' most recent authorization of section 5 in 2006, both the Senate and the House studied the continued need for section 5 by amassing an extensive record that totaled over 15,000 pages, spanned 20 hearings, and included testimony from a total of 96 witnesses representing interests ranging from Federal and State executive officials to civil rights leaders and others. Those 15,000 pages were amassed by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee as well.

Congress paid careful attention to the Court's decisions throughout the reauthorization process and acted consistent with them to the extent of the law, and only after commencing the evidence, strongly suggested widespread violations of the 15th Amendment, which led to ample justification for congressional action.

The result, on July 13, 2006, was the largest bipartisan vote in Voting Rights Act history, with a vote of 390–33 in the House and unanimous passage in the Senate, 98–0.

Although dicta from the Court's *Namundo* decision in 2009 suggested that the burdens of section 5 may be unnecessary because times have changed, Congress found that the evidence strongly suggests otherwise.

While we have made progress, Congress continues to find that racial discrimination in voting is still present and remains concentrated in those places covered by section 5. Unfortunately, the methods of discrimination have also become more sophisticated. I believe that the Court will recognize what Congress found in 2006—that the work of section 5 is not yet complete.

The protections in section 5 don't solely impact our Federal voting processes, but rather the breadth of section 5 extends to the smallest cities and most centralized local governments. When a voting change discriminates against local citizens even at the local level, section 5 has the ability to halt the impact of discrimination. Without section 5's strength to arrest the discrimination at the outset, the burden of remedying the discrimination would be on these local citizens.

The facts in *Shelby County v. Holder* further magnify the importance of section 5 to protect the voting rights of

minorities. In the *Shelby* case, the Justice Department rejected an electoral map drawn by a city in Shelby County which would have decreased the number of black voters from 70.9 percent to 29.5 percent. In this instance, section 5 preserved the ability of the African American community in the city to elect their candidate of choice to the city council. Shelby County, along with many examples examined by Congress in 2006, highlights the importance of reauthorization of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

The constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act is an important matter for the Court to consider and continue to review, and is important to the democratic ideals of this country.

We believe the Supreme Court owes much deference to the considered judgment of the people's elected representatives since Congress continues to find that racial discrimination in voting is present and remains concentrated in many of the places covered by section 5. We expect the United States Supreme Court to continue to declare that section 5 of the Voting Rights Act is critical to protecting minority voting rights—all voting rights—well into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

I was the principal author of the Voting Rights Act extension in 2006, which did pass this House 390–33, and unanimously was passed by the Senate.

□ 1620

The *Shelby* County case concentrates on the constitutionality of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and that is the section that requires pre-clearance of electoral changes in covered jurisdictions. The plaintiffs in the *Shelby* County case allege that since things have changed since 1965, section 5 is no longer applicable. They're wrong.

When Congress considered, in 2006, the extension of the Voting Rights Act, including section 5, the Constitution Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee had probably the most extensive legislative record in the history of this Congress compiled, 12,000 pages on this side of the Capitol, numerous hearings, numerous witnesses, including those who were opposed to section 5, and even those who were opposed to the entire concept of the Voting Rights Act. So every viewpoint was heard; and the mountain of testimony, I don't think, can be equaled by any other issue that Congress has discussed, in my memory, and maybe in the history of the Republic.

I want to make two points. The first point is that all of that testimony very clearly shows that, even in the years immediately prior to 2006, there were attempts at discrimination made, mainly by local governments, to attempt to disenfranchise minority voters. And, in fact, over 700 requests for

pre-clearance were denied, I believe, in the 10-year period prior to the hearings being held. So there still are attempts being made to disenfranchise minority voters, and the Congress found that; and that legislative record should be enough to persuade the Court that those of us who are elected representatives of the people had ample evidence to make a considered judgment on this issue.

The second point that needs to be made is that, right from the beginning of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, there was a procedure that would allow a covered jurisdiction to bail out of section 5 coverage, and that can be done by showing that there are no attempts to disenfranchise minority voters to the satisfaction of the Justice Department. A few jurisdictions have availed themselves of the bailout provision and have succeeded and thus are no longer under section 5.

What the plaintiffs in the Shelby County case want to do is, rather than going and presenting evidence that they are not discriminating anymore and saying that they qualify for the bailout, they want to go to court to throw the whole of section 5 out. It is like dealing with this issue with a blunderbuss rather than with a rifle shot or a surgical strike.

Now, if any of the plaintiffs in this case are clean, I believe that they ought to tell the Court why they're going to court, rather than using the provisions that have been in the law for close to 50 years to bail out, because they are clean.

When I was in law school, I was always taught that when you wanted to get equity, you ought to come in with clean hands. Well, if you have clean hands, the bailout is made for you. And if you don't have clean hands, then the Supreme Court should tell you to go wash up.

The Court should uphold the Voting Rights Act, should uphold section 5, as extensively considered by Congress and reauthorized, and rule in favor of the government.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his observations and his continuing support of this very important act from the beginning. He was there when it started, and he's still with it. I congratulate you, sir.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased now to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, BOBBY SCOTT, a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm proud to join the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan, who were leaders in the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act in 2006. They were there and have been fighting the battle for voting rights for a long time. The leadership in reauthorization was obviously the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. Speaker, a right to vote is the very foundation of our democracy. The Supreme Court noted in *Wesberry v. Sanders* in 1964 that no right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.

From its initial passage of the Voting Rights Act, Congress has relied on an extensive record of discrimination in voting to justify the continued need for remedies imposed by the expiring provisions. In the original enactment of the Voting Rights Act and its subsequent reauthorization, Congress has made sure that voting rights remedies are proportionate to the problems Congress sought to secure.

In the reauthorization process in 2006, the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan made sure that we listened to each and every witness. They had long hearings and heard all kinds of different schemes to undermine the right to vote; and in the end, we reauthorized the Voting Rights Act.

As a result of the Voting Rights Act, since 1964—it was passed in 1965, but since 1964, the number of Black elected officials has increased from a nationwide total of 300 in 1964 to over 9,000 today. The Congressional Black Caucus grew from three prior to the Voting Rights Act to 43 today.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, my home State, there were no African Americans in the General Assembly in 1965. Now there are 18 members of the Virginia Legislative Black Caucus. Clearly, these numbers show that many of the provisions of the Voting Rights Act have made a difference.

Section 5 is one of the Voting Rights Act's most important provisions. It requires covered jurisdictions to submit planned changes in their election laws to Federal officials for prior approval. They have to show that the change does not have a discriminatory effect or intent.

The jurisdictions covered by section 5 were selected the old fashioned way: they earned it, by implementing poll taxes, literacy tests, gerrymandered election districts and other schemes.

Tomorrow the Supreme Court will hear a challenge to section 5. In *Shelby County v. Holder*, the challenge will be to try to eliminate the requirement for covered jurisdictions to secure that pre-clearance from the Department of Justice or a Federal Court in Washington, D.C. They are arguing that the current evidence of racial discriminatory practices in covered jurisdictions is inadequate to support section 5; but the record of section 5-based objections has shown that section 5 is needed.

Since 2006, when we reauthorized the Voting Rights Act, more than 750 ob-

jections have been lodged by the Department of Justice to changes in election procedures through the pre-clearance provision in section 5, finding that those 750 changes violated the Voting Rights Act. Those are changes in election laws that the jurisdictions knew they had to submit to Justice.

Now, just exactly what kind of changes would they have enacted if they hadn't been required to pre-clear their new laws?

Their bipartisan congressional report in 1982 warned that without this section discrimination would reappear overnight. That's because without this section there would be no effective deterrent in passing discriminatory laws.

Section 5 offers a type of relief that is not available in any other provision of the act. Without section 5's relief, jurisdictions with a history of discrimination could pass discriminatory changes in their election laws, and then the victim of the discrimination would bear the costs of litigation and bear the burden of proof to overturn the law.

□ 1630

If overturned, finally, then they could do another scheme and the process would start all over. If those impacted negatively by the discriminatory laws could not raise the money, then they're just stuck with the discriminatory plan.

Now, a lot of these plans are inflicted on small counties where people just do not have the resources to launch expensive, complex litigation. And so it is unfair to impose on them the burden of protecting their voting rights when you know from history that the covered jurisdictions have a history of discrimination.

Now, one of the problems with the elimination of section 5 is that once the small counties raise all the money, get to litigation, finally get a final judgment, and overturn it, the perpetrators of the scheme already would have achieved their goal. They got elected. They were able to represent the area and cast all the votes. And then in the end, when they're finally caught discriminating, they get to run as incumbents, with all the advantages of incumbency. The magic of section 5 is that the illegal scheme never goes into effect to begin with.

Now, there is a provision, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, for covered jurisdictions to bail out if they feel they have stopped discriminating. But all they have to do to bail out is first prove that they haven't gotten caught discriminating in 10 years.

Now, the process is simple. For those who have attempted to bail out, they've been able to bail out. There is no barrier, essentially no barrier, to bailing out from under the provisions of section 5, other than the fact that you couldn't have been caught discriminating in the previous 10 years.

Striking section 5 will essentially turn our country to a pre-1965 election

system. Mr. Speaker, at a time when America has staked so much of its international reputation on the need to spread democracy around the world, we must ensure its vitality here at home and preserve section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for all of his leadership in voting rights and civil rights over the years.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his very astute and precise evaluation of the continuing importance of section 5 to the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. I would now be pleased to yield to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, as much time as she may consume.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman very much, and thank him for convening this historic special order. It's historic because it is led by the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, who has actually walked the historic steps that generated the actual passing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I think it is appropriate to put on the record again, as we've done often, that Mr. CONYERS is the only elected official, certainly Member of the United States Congress, that can claim that they were endorsed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I know that the Honorable BOBBY SCOTT and myself admire that and have benefited from the deep knowledge that JOHN CONYERS has on these important issues.

And I would offer, in my brief commentary this afternoon, to try to track the vitality of the Voting Rights Act in its series of reauthorizations so that people can actually see that this is not legislation of whiners, this is not a legislation that is not in love with America, does not believe in the freedom of America's values and choice and being able to vote unencumbered, or not view the integrity of State election officials throughout the country. But it really is, if you will, a testament to the fact that laws can make things better.

In actuality, the Voting Rights Act is a codification of the 15th Amendment that no one shall be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. That was a necessary amendment and followed in the tradition of the 13th and 14th Amendments, which provide for due process and equal treatment under the law.

Then, of course, the 15th Amendment, which says that the vote is precious. It's so precious, and sometimes we forget that it was actually embodied in the Bill of Rights or in the context of the Constitution, that the 15th Amendment was, in fact, protecting the right to vote.

So the Voting Rights Act came as the leaders of this Nation watched the deterioration of the right to vote in

certain parts of this Nation. And I would argue that that is true even today.

We heard on the floor that there is a way to, in essence, move yourself out of the Voting Rights Act by showing 10 years of, might I say with all due respect, good behavior.

But as we have watched over the last few years, let me recount for you, Mr. Speaker, that we have had incidences that impact school boards to governorships, if you will, or school boards to statehouses, and school boards to congressional seats, where there have been instances that have required the intervention of preclearance under the Voting Rights Act of section 5.

I would venture to say that no one has been hurt by that, that it has only enhanced the opportunity to vote. In the State of Texas, for example, in the last 2 years, there was an issue of purging voters. It so happened that those who were being purged were predominantly Hispanic and African American. In the last election of 2012, the State of Florida was poised to purge some 1 million voters, and through oversight of the Department of Justice that was, in essence, stopped.

In addition, we've had a series of what we've called voter ID laws, which came about and were born post, if you will, the election of 2010. Those voter ID laws were determined through preclearance to have a deteriorating effect on the vote of those who were needed to carry forth a vote.

And so I would make the argument that the voter ID laws were, in essence, prevented from taking the vote away under the 15th Amendment, the Voting Rights Act, because we had section 5. And so the Texas voter ID law was declared to not meet the standards under section 5 preclearance, that it would hamper people from voting. And, in essence, it hampered people from voting because it did not have the process to get your voter ID in all the counties in the State of Texas.

So if you were in a county without a place to get your voter ID, if you didn't have the money, you clearly were prevented from voting. And that covered voters from all different races—voter ID laws that happened in Mississippi, voter ID laws that happened in Ohio. Some of them were undone through election processes, but the preclearance truly impacts real lives.

I remember as a junior member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which I work for, doing registration in the Deep South, as it was defined in those years, in South Carolina, going onto plantations where sharecroppers worked and the intimidation of the process of not only registering, but voting. We were there to register to vote.

The reason why I know there was intimidation is because as I was approaching a voting station, which was a tattered area—when I say tattered, the voting booth was a tattered cloth from an old general store. My com-

mentary is not to speak of that particular era of voting, but it was to say to you that I was promptly shot at for approaching. I was a stranger. And the next thing I knew we were running for cover. But all I was coming to do was to check the voting process out to ensure that the employees of that plantation, sharecroppers, were coming and could vote unencumbered.

So the Voting Rights Act is about unencumbered voting. What person would want to deny that?

Tomorrow, we will have a hearing before the United States Supreme Court in the Shelby case. And my argument—I'm not making the argument before the Supreme Court as we speak today—but my argument is that facts will speak for themselves. The courts will address the question of law, and they will listen to the proponents and the opponents.

I hope and pray that the Justices will understand that the underpinnings of the argument are based upon fact. And in the last election of 2012, there was an enormous mountain of facts that showed that in the nooks and crannies of America there were voters who were denied the right to vote. In 2008, voters were denied the right to vote—issues such as moving various polling places that were in minority neighborhoods, the misrepresentation of the message going out about felons would be arrested at the polls, as if the felons who could not vote would be showing up at the polls, or others being determined to be a felon and not be a felon, the misidentification of voters, sending them away.

□ 1640

I would just make the argument that this is a factual basis for which we need this. The fact that we have had these kinds of incidences shows the value of the Voting Rights Act section 5 preclearance. We show the value through 15,000 pages of documentation in the 2006 reauthorization, which was led by this Judiciary Committee, of which those of us on the floor today are members, led by JOHN CONYERS and, of course, Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

So let me conclude by thanking the chairman for his very kind yielding. I'll indicate that we can speak about the four corners of section 5, Supreme Court case that has reaffirmed it, but this is a question of fact. Until we eliminate the facts across America that people are denied the right to vote on the basis of their color and/or their race, then we have a reason for section 5 preclearance.

With that, I yield back in the name of freedom, in the name of justice, and in the name of those who lost their lives fighting for such and fighting for America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the need to protect democracy, to protect the voice of the American people, and to ensure the right to vote continues to be treated as a right under the Constitution rather than being treated as though it is privilege.

If you are a Constitutional Scholar this is an exciting time because the United States Supreme Court has a very active docket this term, deciding on matters which have great import to every American.

And pursuant to that, in less than two days the Supreme Court will hear the case of *Shelby County Alabama v. Holder*. The issue in this case is whether Congress' decision in 2006 to reauthorize Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act under the pre-existing coverage formula of Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act exceeded its authority under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and thus violated the Tenth Amendment and Article IV of the United States Constitution.

The challenge to the constitutionality of Section 5 in this case was brought by Shelby County, Ala., which is a majority white suburb of Birmingham.

In rejecting the County's arguments Judge Bates agreed with an earlier unanimous decision, by a three-judge panel of the D.C. District Court, which likewise upheld the constitutionality of Section 5, in a case brought by a local Texas utility district, which is my home state.

That earlier decision, however, was vacated in 2009 when the Supreme Court decided that the utility district could pursue a statutory "bailout" from Section 5 coverage.

Unlike the Texas utility district, Shelby County freely admitted that it has a recent history of voting discrimination that disqualified it from "bailing out."

I am joined by my colleagues here today to call on all Americans to reject and denounce tactics and measures that have absolutely no place in our democracy. I call on African-Americans, Hispanic and Latino Americans, as well as Asian-American voters to band together to fight for their right to vote and to work together to understand their voting rights which are granted to citizens of our nation by our laws and our Constitution.

I call on these citizens to stand against harassment and intimidation, to vote in the face of such adversity. The most effective way to curb tactics of intimidation and harassment is to vote. Is to stand together to fight against any measures that would have the effect of preventing every eligible citizen from being able to vote. Voting ensures active participation in democracy.

As a Member of this body and of the House Judiciary Committee which has primary jurisdiction over voting matters, I firmly believe that we must protect the rights of all eligible citizens to vote. Over the past few decades, minorities in this country have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters through so-called "Voter Id" requirements. I am sad to report that as we head into the 21st century, these efforts continue.

Never in the history of our nation, has the effect of one person, one vote, been more important. A great Spanish Philosopher, George Santayana once said "Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it." Our history has taught us that denying the right to vote based on race, gender or class is a stain on the democratic principles that we all value. The Voting Rights Act was a reaction to the actions of our passed and a way to pave the road to a new future.

The Voting Rights Act (VRA) was adopted in 1965 and was extended in 1970, 1975, and 1982. This legislation is considered the most

successful piece of civil rights legislation ever adopted by the United States Congress. Contrary to the prevailing rumor that the Act is due to expire, leaving minorities with no rights, the Act is actually due for reauthorization in the 2nd session of the 108th Congress—there is no doubt about whether it will continue to protect our rights in the future.

The VRA codifies and effectuates the 15th Amendment's permanent guarantee that, throughout the nation, no person shall be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. Adopted at a time when African Americans were substantially disfranchised in many Southern states, the Act employed measures to restore the right to vote to citizens of all U.S. states.

By 1965, proponents of disenfranchisement made violent attempts to thwart the efforts of civil rights activists. The murder of voting-rights activists in Philadelphia and Mississippi gained national attention, along with numerous other acts of violence and terrorism.

Finally, the unprovoked attack on March 7, 1965, by state troopers on peaceful marchers crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, en route to the state capitol in Montgomery, persuaded the President and Congress to overcome Southern legislators' resistance to effective voting rights legislation. President Johnson issued a call for a strong voting rights law and hearings began soon thereafter on the bill that would become the Voting Rights Act.

Congress adopted this far-reaching statute in response to a rash of instances of interference with attempts by African American citizens to exercise their right to vote—a rash that appears to be manifesting itself again in this nation. Perhaps a legislative measure is needed to respond in a way that the VRA did.

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the VRA in 1966 in a landmark decision—*South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 327–28:

Congress had found that case-by-case litigation was inadequate to combat widespread and persistent discrimination in voting, because of the inordinate amount of time and energy required to overcome the obstructionist tactics invariably encountered in these lawsuits. After enduring nearly a century of systematic resistance to the Fifteenth Amendment, Congress might well decide to shift the advantage of time and inertia from the perpetrators of the evil to its victims.

It seems that the "obstructionist tactics" that threatened the aggrieved parties in *Katzenbach* have returned. The advantages of "time and inertia" that were shifted from bigoted bureaucrats to minority victims are slowly shifting back against their favor when educators, government leaders, and agencies are allowed to contravene the policy and legal conclusions given by the highest court in the country.

Several factors influenced the initiation of this civil rights legislation. The first was a large shift in the number of African Americans away from the Republican Party. Second, many Democrats felt that it was a mistake of its Southern members to oppose civil rights legislation because they could lose more of the African American and liberal votes.

No right is more fundamental than the right to vote. It is protected by more constitutional amendments—the 1st, 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th and 26th—than any other right we enjoy as Americans. Broad political participation en-

sures the preservation of all our other rights and freedoms. Third, State laws that impose new restrictions on voting, however, undermine our strong democracy by impeding access to the polls and reducing the number of Americans who vote and whose votes are counted.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION

There have been several restrictive voting bills considered and approved by states in the past several years. The most commonly advanced initiatives are laws that require voters to present photo identification when voting in person. Additionally, states have proposed or passed laws to require proof of citizenship when registering to vote; to eliminate the right to register to vote and to submit a change of address within the same state on Election Day; to shorten the time allowed for early voting; to make it more difficult for third-party organizations to conduct voter registration; and even to eliminate a mandate on poll workers to direct voters who go to the wrong precinct.

These recent changes are on top of the disfranchisement laws in 48 states that deprive an estimated 5.3 million people with criminal convictions—disproportionately African Americans and Latinos—of their political voice.

Voter ID laws are becoming increasingly common across the country. Today, 31 states have laws requiring voters to present some form of identification to vote in federal, state and local elections, although some laws or initiatives passed in 2011 have not yet gone into effect. Some must also be pre-cleared under the Voting Rights Act prior to implementation. In 16 of those 31 States, voters must (or will soon be required to) present a photo ID—that in many states must be government-issued—in order to cast a ballot.

Voter ID laws deny the right to vote to thousands of registered voters who do not have, and, in many instances, cannot obtain the limited identification states accept for voting. Many of these Americans cannot afford to pay for the required documents needed to secure a government issued photo ID. As such, these laws impede access to the polls and are at odds with the fundamental right to vote.

In total, more than 21 million Americans of voting age lack documentation that would satisfy photo ID laws, and a disproportionate number of these Americans are low-income, racial and ethnic minorities, and elderly. As many as 25% of African Americans of voting age lack government-issued photo ID, compared to only 8% of their white counterparts. Eighteen percent of Americans over the age of 65 do not have government-issued photo ID.

Laws requiring photo identification to vote are a "solution" in search of a problem. There is no credible evidence that in-person impersonation voter fraud—the only type of fraud that photo IDs could prevent—is even a minor problem. Multiple studies have found that almost all cases of alleged in-person impersonation voter "fraud" are actually the result of a voter making an inadvertent mistake about their eligibility to vote, and that even these mistakes are extremely infrequent.

It is important, instead, to focus on both expanding the franchise and ending practices which actually threaten the integrity of the elections, such as improper purges of voters, voter harassment, and distribution of false information about when and where to vote. None of these issues, however, are addressed

or can be resolved with a photo ID requirement.

Furthermore, requiring voters to pay for an ID, as well as the background documents necessary to obtain an ID in order to vote, is tantamount to a poll tax. Although some states issue IDs for free, the birth certificates, passports, or other documents required to secure a government-issued ID cost money, and many Americans simply cannot afford to pay for them. In addition, obtaining a government-issued photo ID is not an easy task for all members of the electorate. Low-income individuals who lack the funds to pay for documentation, people with disabilities with limited access to transportation, and elderly.

Americans who never had a birth certificate and cannot obtain alternate proof of their birth in the U.S., are among those who face significant or insurmountable obstacles to getting the photo ID needed to exercise their right to vote. For example, because of Texas' recently passed voter ID law, an estimated 36,000 people in West Texas's District 19 are 137 miles from the nearest full service Department of Public Safety office, where those without IDs must travel to preserve their right to vote under the state's new law.

In addition, women who have changed their names due to marriage or divorce often experience difficulties with identity documentation, as did Andrea, who recently moved from Massachusetts to South Carolina and who, in the span of a month, spent more than 17 hours online and in person trying without success to get a South Carolina driver's license.

Voter ID laws send not-so-subtle messages about who is and is not encouraged to vote. As states approve laws requiring photo ID to vote, each formulates its own list of acceptable forms of documentation. Another common thread emerging from disparate state approaches is a bias against robust student electoral participation.

Henceforth, students at Wisconsin colleges and universities will not be able to vote using their student ID cards, unless those cards have issuance dates, expiration dates, and signatures.

Currently, only a handful of Wisconsin colleges and universities are issuing compliant IDs. Nor will South Carolina, Texas, or Tennessee accept student identification at the polls.

Policies that limit students' electoral participation are particularly suspect, appearing on the heels of unprecedented youth turnout in the 2008 election.

Four states with new voter identification mandates, including my home state of Texas, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama, are required under the Voting Rights Act to have these voting changes pre-cleared by either the Department of Justice (DOJ) or a panel of federal judges. Before they may be implemented, DOJ must certify that these laws do not have the purpose or effect of restricting voting by racial or language minority groups.

Thus far, South Carolina and Texas both have submitted applications to DOJ that have been formally opposed in written submissions. DOJ has requested further information from both states, and the applications are on hold. Alabama's ID requirements do not take effect until 2014, so the state has not yet applied to DOJ for preclearance. Mississippi's voter ID requirement was approved by voters on November 8, 2011, so a preclearance request has not yet been submitted.

In countries scattered across this earth, citizens are denied the right to speak their hearts and minds. In this country, only a few decades ago, the right to vote was limited by race, sex, or the financial ability to own land. When a vote is not cast, it is a referendum on all those who fought so hard and tirelessly for our rights. When a vote is cast, it is cast not only for you and the future but also for all those who never had the chance to pull a lever.

We are still working to make Martin Luther King's dream a reality, a reality in which our government's decisions are made out in the open not behind cigar filled closed doors.

The time to take back the country is at hand, and we are the ones with the power to do just that. To do so we must allow all citizens who are eligible to vote, with the right to exercise this decision without tricks or tactics to dilute their right to vote.

Instances of voter intimidation are not long ago and far away. Just last year I sent a letter to U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder to draw his attention to several disturbing instances of voter intimidation that had taken place in Houston. In a single week there were at least 15 report of abuse of voter rights throughout the city of Houston.

As a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I called for an immediate investigation of these instances. Many of these incidents of voter intimidation were occurring in predominately minority neighborhoods and have been directed at African-Americans and Latinos. It is unconscionable to think that anyone would deliberately employ the use of such forceful and intimidating tactics to undermine the fundamental, Constitutional right to vote. However, such conduct has regrettably occurred in Houston, and I urge you to take appropriate action to ensure that it does not recur.

I am here today in the name of freedom, patriotism, and democracy. I am here to demand that the long hard fought right to vote continues to be protected.

A long, bitter, and bloody struggle was fought for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 so that all Americans could enjoy the right to vote, regardless of race, ethnicity, or national origin. Americans died in that fight so that others could achieve what they had been forcefully deprived of for centuries—the ability to walk freely and without fear into the polling place and cast a voting ballot.

Efforts to keep minorities from fully exercising that franchise, however, continue. Indeed, in the past thirty years, we have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters including efforts that were deemed "Ballot Security" programs that include the mailing of threatening notices to African-American voters, the carrying of video cameras to monitor polls, the systematic challenging of minority voters at the polls on unlawful grounds, and the hiring of guards and off-duty police officers to intimidate and frighten voters at the polls.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a particularly poor track record when it comes to documented acts of voter intimidation. In 1982, a Federal Court in New Jersey provided a consent order that forbids the Republican National Committee from undertaking any ballot security activities in a polling place or election district where race or ethnic composition is a factor in the decision to conduct such activities and where a purpose or signifi-

cant effect is to deter qualified voters from voting. These reprehensible practices continue to plague our Nation's minority voters.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT HISTORY

August 6, 2011, marked the 46th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act.

Most Americans take the right to vote for granted. We assume that we can register and vote if we are over 18 and are citizens. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War.

Before the 1965 Voting Rights Act, however, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924, state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans. It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans.

And the Voting Rights Act has made giant strides toward that goal. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever. The act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. And Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

We must not forget the importance of protecting this hard earned right.

VOTER ID

An election with integrity is one that is open to every eligible voter. Restrictive voter ID requirements degrade the integrity of our elections by systematically excluding large numbers of eligible Americans.

I do not argue with the notion that we must prevent individuals from voting who are not allowed to vote. Yet a hidden argument in this bill is that immigrants may "infiltrate" our voting system. Legal immigrants who have successfully navigated the citizenship maze are unlikely to draw the attention of the authorities by attempting to register incorrectly. Similarly, undocumented immigrants are even less likely to risk deportation just to influence an election.

If for no other reason than after a major disaster be it earthquakes, fires, floods or hurricanes, we must all understand how vulnerable our system is. Families fleeing the hurricanes and fires suffered loss of property that included lost documents. Compounding this was

the devastation of the region, which virtually shut down civil services in the area. For example, New Orleans residents after Hurricane Katrina were scattered across 44 states. These uprooted citizens had difficulty registering and voting both with absentee ballots and at satellite voting stations. As a result, those elections took place fully 8 months after the disaster, and it required the efforts of nonprofits, such as the NAACP, to ensure that voters had the access they are constitutionally guaranteed.

We need to address the election fraud that we know occurring, such as voting machine integrity and poll volunteer training and competence. After every election that occurs in this country, we have solid documented evidence of voting inconsistencies and errors. In 2004, in New Mexico, malfunctioning machines mysteriously failed to properly register a presidential vote on more than 20,000 ballots. 1 million ballots nationwide were flawed by faulty voting equipment—roughly one for every 100 cast.

Those who face the most significant barriers are not only the poor, minorities, and rural populations. 1.5 million college students, whose addresses change often, and the elderly, will also have difficulty providing documentation.

In fact, newly married individuals face significant barriers to completing a change in surname. For instance, it can take 6–8 weeks to receive the marriage certificate in the mail, another two weeks (and a full day waiting in line) to get the new Social Security card, and finally three-four weeks to get the new driver's license. There is a significant possibility that this bill will also prohibit newlyweds from voting if they are married within three months of Election Day.

The right to vote is a critical and sacred constitutionally protected civil right. To challenge this is to erode our democracy, challenge justice, and mock our moral standing. I urge my colleagues to join me in dismissing this crippling legislation, and pursue effective solutions to the real problems of election fraud and error. We cannot let the rhetoric of an election year destroy a fundamental right upon which we have established liberty and freedom.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCOTT, and Ms. JACKSON LEE, for their contributions.

We have no further requests for time. Under those circumstances, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING LIEUTENANT ERIC WALLACE AND LIEUTENANT GREGORY PICKARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 and 16, a couple of weeks ago, America lost two more heroes and dedicated first responders. On those dates, the Bryan Fire Department responded to a fire at the Knights of Columbus Hall in Bryan, Texas. This blaze was fierce, and ultimately the roof col-

lapsed, taking the lives of Lieutenant Eric Wallace and Lieutenant Gregory Pickard. In addition, firefighters Ricky Mantey, Jr., and Mitch Moran were critically injured during the rescue operation.

Lieutenant Gregory Pickard was born in Guymon, Oklahoma, and eventually made his way to the great State of Texas. Pickard was a 32-year veteran of the Bryan Fire Department. During those 32 years, he served our community through one of the darkest days of our community, the collapse of the bonfire at Texas A&M University. Lieutenant Pickard served as a rescue division commander during the search and rescue of the victims and, ultimately, the 12 fallen students. He rose through the ranks and served as battalion chief from 1999 to 2005 before choosing to step back to lieutenant to finish out his career. Pickard also served as an EMT and obtained his Advanced Firefighter certificate, and he was a leader in establishing many of the current Bryan Fire Department firefighting operations.

Lieutenant Eric Wallace was born here in our Nation's capital and, just like Lieutenant Pickard, eventually found his way to Texas. He also adapted quickly to our Texas culture and became an avid hunter. Wallace was a 13-year veteran of the Bryan Fire Department, and in 2010 he received an award for bravery during a fire in 2009 from the 100 Club.

On February 20, I attended the memorial service for both of these honorable men and stood with their families and friends, their fellow first responders, and the hundreds of citizens in attendance to honor and recognize these local heroes. We all mourned, and yet we celebrated the lives of both these great men. On February 21 and February 22, Lieutenant Eric Wallace and Lieutenant Gregory Pickard were laid to rest in Marlin and Bryan, Texas.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the families and many friends of Lieutenant Wallace and Lieutenant Pickard. They will forever be remembered as outstanding firefighters, husbands, and devoted fathers. We thank them and their families for their service and their sacrifice for our community.

Also, our thoughts and prayers are with firefighters Ricky Mantey, Jr., and Mitch Moran, who were critically injured during the fire. We pray that our Heavenly Father will give them a speedy recovery and comfort their families.

The sacrifices of these men model the words of Jesus in John 15:13, where he said:

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

God bless our first responders, and God bless America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1913

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 47, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–10) on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 298. An act to prevent nuclear proliferation in North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

510. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, "Independent Oversight Activities of the Department of Energy's Office of Health, Safety and Security for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

511. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to Section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, notification of the President's intent to drawdown funds in defense

services of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

512. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

513. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-589, "The Elizabeth Ministry, Inc. Affordable Housing Initiative Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

514. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-590, "Neighborhood Contractor Daytime Parking Permit Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-612, "Breath Test Admissibility in Criminal Proceedings Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-591, "Parkside Parcel E and J Mixed-Income Apartments Tax Abatement Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

517. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-630, "Reckless Driving Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

518. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-629, "District Department of Transportation DC Streetcar Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-592, "Public Library Hours Expansion Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

520. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-628, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 393, S.O. 11-08780, Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

521. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-593, "Howard Town Center Real Property Tax Abatement Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

522. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-610, "Ignition Interlock Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-611, "Chuck Brown Park Designation Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

524. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-613, "Grandparent Caregivers Program Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

525. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-627, "Child Sex-

ual Abuse Reporting Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

526. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-615, "Sustainable DC Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

527. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-626, "Greater Mount Calvary Way Designation Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

528. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-616, "Controlled Substance, Alcohol Testing, Criminal Background Check and Background Investigation Temporary Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

529. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-625, "Access to Justice for Bicyclists Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

530. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Financing Corporation, transmitting a copy of the Financing Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2012 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

531. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2012 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

532. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's "Major" final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 120731291-2522-02] (RIN: 0648-BC40) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 83. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Rept. 113-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 819. A bill to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 820. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to enhance the reporting requirements pertaining to use of antimicrobial drugs in food animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 821. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide surviving spouses with certain protections relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 822. A bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 823. A bill to preserve American space leadership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 824. A bill to reduce the total number of civil service employees in the executive branch of the Government through attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BARBER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 825. A bill to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 826. A bill to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking any action to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 827. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to provide one-time payments from the SIPC Fund for customers during a pending lawsuit by the Securities and Exchange Commission against the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUCHON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOMMERT, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 828. A bill to rescind \$45 billion of unobligated discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 829. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of

Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HALL, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 830. A bill to provide immigration reform by securing America's borders, clarifying and enforcing existing laws, and enabling a practical employer verification program; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, Agriculture, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 831. A bill to phase out special wage certificates under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 under which individuals with disabilities may be employed at subminimum wage rates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 832. A bill to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 833. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Purple Heart occupy a position of precedence above the new Distinguished Warfare Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 834. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct cost-benefit analyses for the provision of medical care by the Department of Veterans Affairs in certain geographic areas served by multiple Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 835. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 836. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the requirement that permit applications for the discharge of pollutants be approved by disinterested board members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the availability of the saver's credit, to make the credit re-

fundable, and to make Federal matching contributions into the retirement savings of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 838. A bill to provide grants to States in order to prevent racial profiling; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 839. A bill to require the lender or servicer of a home mortgage, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a prompt decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 840. A bill to improve services for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 841. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 842. A bill to expand the research activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to functional gastrointestinal and motility disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 843. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a grant program to support the restoration of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 844. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the eligibility period for veterans to enroll in certain vocational rehabilitation programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate campaign contributions for Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DELANEY):

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. WATT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 81. A resolution supporting the designation of National Digital Literacy Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 82. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 84. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans Week; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 85. A resolution recognizing the importance of acknowledging the contributions of Dominican-Americans to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that "Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause

Article I, Section 8

The Commerce Clause.

Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—
 “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I whereby Congress is given the authority to appropriate moneys in the Treasury.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution:

Congress has the power “to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, in creating the authority of the Congress to, “Establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.”

and

The 14th Amendment of the Constitution stating that, “All persons born or naturalized in the United States,” are, “citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.”

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution”.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, and 14), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution and Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, section 8, clause 1 and clause 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.J. Res. 32.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 104: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 129: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 137: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 138: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 140: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 142: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 148: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 164: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 165: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 207: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 217: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 227: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 258: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 269: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 300: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 301: Ms. MENG, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 310: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 311: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 312: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 333: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 341: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 354: Ms. TITUS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 366: Ms. BASS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 383: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 384: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 386: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 398: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 401: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARBER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 411: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 422: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 423: Mrs. BLACK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 447: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 452: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BARBER, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FARR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 482: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 493: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 496: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 517: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 520: Ms. CHU and Mr. VEASEY.	H.R. 570: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. SCHWARTZ.	H.R. 627: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 526: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.	H.R. 573: Mr. LOWENTHAL.	H.R. 629: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 530: Mr. MICHAUD.	H.R. 582: Mr. COLE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.	H.R. 647: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 543: Mr. POSEY.	H.R. 597: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. CAPUANO.	
H.R. 565: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.	H.R. 607: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, and Ms. JENKINS.	
H.R. 569: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.	H.R. 612: Mr. SCHOCK.	H.R. 656: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.